

House bill for the relief of the heirs of Nathan D. Adams—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: Resolutions of Lithographers' Protective Beneficial Association, Coshocton, Ohio, for the exclusion of illiterate immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WEEKS: Resolution of the board of control of State house of correction and prison at Marquette, Mich., relative to the restriction of transportation of prison-made merchandise—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, April 16, 1902.

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CLAPP, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved. It is approved.

### REPORT ON FRAUDULENT ENTRY OF CHINESE LABORERS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication from the Secretary of the Treasury; which was read, and ordered to lie on the table:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, April 14, 1902.

SIR: In response to Senate resolution of 9th instant, I have the honor to inform you that thus far the official report made to the Treasury Department by Inspector James E. Dunn, referred to in said Senate resolution, has not been found among the correspondence on file in the Department.

It is recalled in the Bureau of Immigration that such a report was made, embodying, as well, various other matters in relation to the enforcement of the Chinese-exclusion laws at the port of San Francisco; but under the system of filing of the said Bureau some question of administration would be taken as the subject of such a report, and it would be given an appropriate number designating that subject rather than a statement of the nature referred to in the Senate resolution. The search, however, will be continued, and when found, if still desirable, the official report referred to will be forwarded.

Respectfully,

L. M. SHAW,  
Secretary.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,  
Washington, D. C.

### STATUE OF GEN. ULYSSES S. GRANT.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the report of the Grant Statue or Memorial Commission relative to the selection of a site, plans, and designs for a statue or memorial of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, late President of the United States and General of the armies thereof, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, were referred to the Committee on the Library, and ordered to be printed.

### LANDS OF THE CHEROKEE NATION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a memorial of the national council of the Cherokee Nation requesting the individualization of the lands and disbursements of moneys, etc., together with a draft of a bill prepared by direction of the Secretary; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

### CHINESE EXCLUSION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The President of the Senate has received a communication from the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, relating to the pending Chinese bill, with the request that it be read. Is there any objection to its being read? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read the communication.

The communication was read, and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,  
Washington, D. C., April 15, 1902.

Hon. WILLIAM P. FRYE,  
President pro tempore United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The undersigned, the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, being in session in this city of Washington, D. C., had under consideration the matter of legislation relative to the exclusion of the Chinese laborers from the United States and its insular territory. It may be unnecessary to indicate how deeply interested are the men and women of our country whom we have the honor to represent in the matter of this legislation, and desirous of serving them, as well as all people of our country, to the very best of our ability, we have adopted the following preambles and resolution:

"Whereas the Philippines, with their large Chinese population of the pure and mixed blood and their proximity to China, serve, and could to a greater degree serve, as a reservoir of Chinese laborers, and a bridge over which Chinese could and would come to the mainland territory of the United States unless stopped by effective legislation; and

"Whereas any law which does not exactly define the meaning to be given to the treaty terms 'official,' 'teacher,' 'student,' 'merchant,' and 'traveler' would, in view of Chinese duplicity, be a mockery and of no value; and

"Whereas the seamen are clearly entitled to equal protection from Chinese competition and contamination as are other workers in our common country; and

"Whereas the validity of the entire Scott Act of 1888 is in controversy in an appeal case now pending before the Supreme Court, and it is generally admitted that the attack will be sustained by the court, neither the Proctor bill nor the Platt amendment dealing in any way with these new questions or the emergency which will beyond doubt arise by the court's decision:

"Resolved by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor in session assembled, That we hold said Proctor bill and Platt amendment utterly inadequate and contrary to the best interests of labor all over the country, in the mills of New England or the Carolinas, as well as the workers on the Pacific coast and in the intermountain States; and

"Further resolved, That we are firmly convinced that the Mitchell-Kahn bill, as reported from the Committee on Immigration and passed by the House of Representatives, is the only exclusion bill that will exclude now before Congress; and we therefore urge all true friends of the policy of the exclusion of Chinese laborers from the United States to vote for this bill and to defeat any amendment offered thereto tending to weaken it in any of its essential or effective features."

We sincerely trust that this petition, embodying our best judgment, may meet with your favorable consideration, and that you may honor us by presenting the same to the Senate in session.

Thanking you in advance, in anticipation of your compliance with our request, we have the honor to remain,

Very respectfully,

Samuel Gompers, of New York, president; James Duncan, Boston, Mass., first vice-president; John Mitchell, Indianapolis, Ind., second vice-president; James O'Connell, Oil City, Pa., third vice-president; Max Morris, Denver, Colo., fourth vice-president; Thomas I. Kidd, Chicago, Ill., fifth vice-president; D. A. Hayes, Newark, Ohio, sixth vice-president; John B. Lennon, Illinois, treasurer; Frank Morrison, of Chicago, secretary, executive council American Federation of Labor [seal].

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The President of the Senate has received 61 additional telegraphic memorials from the Pacific coast against the Mitchell bill (so-called) and for the Platt amendment. Also 2 from Seattle, protesting against the seamen clause; also 12 from the labor unions of Portland, Me., in favor of the Mitchell bill and against the Platt amendment. The President of the Senate does not feel like filling the RECORD with these telegrams, and will suggest, if there be no objection, that they simply be noted in the RECORD. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. TURNER. Do I understand that some of those telegrams are from Seattle?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There are two from Seattle. Mr. TURNER. I should like to have an opportunity to examine them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. They are by themselves here. The telegrams were ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

A telegram from S. M. Mears, president of the board of trustees, Chamber of Commerce of Portland, Oreg.;

A telegram from A. H. Mohler, president of the Portland and Asiatic Steamship Company of Portland, Oreg.;

A telegram from John Breuner Company, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from Charles Forman, ex-president of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal.;

A telegram from George H. Stewart, of Los Angeles, Cal.;

A telegram from R. P. Burr, of Sacramento, Cal.;

A telegram from Theodore B. Wilcox, president of the Portland Flouring Mills Company, of Portland, Oreg.;

A telegram from John F. Francis, of Los Angeles, Cal.;

A telegram from H. J. Knowles, secretary of the Pacific Steam Whaling Company, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from William Wolfe & Co., of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from Lawrence Harris, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from O. G. Sage, of Sacramento, Cal.;

A telegram from W. A. Kelsey, of the Los Angeles Capital, of Los Angeles, Cal.;

A telegram from J. F. Sims, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from T. M. Stevens & Co., of Portland, Oreg.;

A telegram from W. E. Dennison, president of the Steiger Terra Cotta and Pottery Works, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from Gladding, McBean & Co., of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from Charles E. Fredericks, president of Joseph Fredericks & Co., Incorporated, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from J. Eppinger, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from G. W. McNear, jr., of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from H. L. Tatum, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from Thomas C. Berry, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from T. C. Gibbons, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from L. Kauffman, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from E. A. Bresse, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from George H. Higbee, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from Andrew E. Moseley, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from George P. Morrow, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from John Herd, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from G. W. Hume, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from George W. Scott, of the Scott & Van Arsdale Lumber Company, Incorporated, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from Meyer Wilson & Co., of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from G. H. Fuller, president of the George H. Fuller Desk Company, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from G. V. Selby, manager of the Boston Woven Hose and Rubber Company, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from J. D. Harron, president of Harron, Rickard & McConne, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from C. W. Weaver, secretary of Studebaker Brothers Company of California, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from E. D. Page, manager of the Howe Scale Company, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from Joseph Rosenberg, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from Juda Newman, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from W. G. Lowry, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from O'Brien & Sons, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from W. F. Soule, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from William Rennie, for Fairbanks, Morse & Co., of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from E. W. Ferguson, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from S. J. Newman, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from Isaac L. Requa, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from H. C. Norton, vice-president and manager of the Pacific Coast Rubber Company, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from Redington & Co., of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from Clark & Sons, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from C. F. Runyon, secretary of the Goodyear Rubber Company, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from Murphy Grant & Co., of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from Whittier Coburn Company, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from H. T. Lally, manager for the Crane Company, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from Mack & Co., of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from A. B. Costigan, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from S. B. McNear, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from the treasurer of the Nathan Dohrmann Company, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from Francis Smith & Co., of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from Vanderlinn Stow, secretary of the Thomas Day Company, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from Girvin & Eyre, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from John W. Classen, secretary of the Tacoma Mill Company, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A telegram from Frank Waterhouse & Co., of Seattle, Wash.;

A telegram from Moran Brothers' Company, of Seattle, Wash.;

A telegram from M. H. Schlitter, secretary of the Granite Cutters' Union, of Portland, Me.;

A telegram from W. J. Lappen, secretary of the Barbers' Union, of Portland, Me.;

A telegram from S. C. Phillips, agent of the Seamen's Union, of Portland, Me.;

A telegram from A. Reed, secretary of the Team Drivers' Union, of Portland, Me.;

A telegram from James H. Flynn, recording secretary of the Painters' Union, of Portland, Me.;

A telegram from John C. Clarke, secretary of Iron Molders' Union, of Portland, Me.;

A telegram from Michael McDonough, for the Masons' Union, of Portland, Me.;

A telegram from D. A. Cameron, secretary of the Carpenters' Union of Portland, Me.;

A telegram from J. H. Dooley, president of the Typographical Union of Portland, Me.;

A telegram from Charles L. Fox, secretary of the Central Labor Union of Portland, Me.;

A telegram from Patrick J. Joyce, vice-president of Bricklayers Tenders' Union of Portland, Me.; and

A telegram from James J. Mullen, secretary of Cigar Makers' Union of Portland, Me.

Mr. PERKINS. I present a telegraphic petition signed by M. Casey, president, and John McLaughlin, secretary, of Brotherhood of Teamsters of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the passage of the pending Chinese-exclusion bill, and remonstrating against any substitute or amendment therefor. I move that the dispatch lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KITTREDGE presented a petition of Prairie Lodge, No. 170, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Huron, S. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation to exclude Chinese laborers from the United States and their insular possessions; which was referred to lie on the table.

Mr. QUAY presented petitions of General James B. Rickett Post, No. 57, of Dillsburg; of John Ennis Post, No. 47, of St. Clair; of Jesse Taylor Post, No. 450, of Mount Morris; of Post No. 95, of Bellefonte; of Major W. G. Lowry Post, No. 548, of Wilkinsburg; of Captain Lyons Post, No. 85, of Glenwood; of Samuel Kress Post, No. 284, of Slatington; of C. S. Davis Post, No. 148, of Selins-

grove, and of Lieutenant David H. Nessley Post, of Mount Joy, all of the Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation providing pensions to certain officers and men in the Army and Navy of the United States when 50 years of age and over, and to increase the pensions of widows of soldiers to \$12 per month; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. PATTERSON, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1300) granting a pension to Judson N. Pollard; and

A bill (S. 3505) granting an increase of pension to Matthew B. Noel.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1299) granting a pension to Ambrus U. Harrison, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HAWLEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9455) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of Lorenzo Marchant, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs; which was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON, from the Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 13123) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CLAPP introduced a bill (S. 5272) for the relief of Darwin S. Hall; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 5273) to amend section 4139 and section 4314 of the Revised Statutes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MILLARD introduced a bill (S. 5274) to remove the charge of desertion from the name of Frederick W. Joslin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 5275) to provide for the purchase of lands that may be required for military purposes and for the building of barracks and quarters thereon, to be paid for from the proceeds of the sale of abandoned military reservations; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### AMENDMENT TO APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. QUAY submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$255 for the purchase of "The Jesuit Relations" for the library of the Military Academy, intended to be proposed by him to the Military Academy appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

#### EXPENSES OF MILITARY OPERATIONS, ETC., IN THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. CULBERSON. I submit a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to send to the Senate the following:

1. A statement of the amount of money paid by the United States for or on account of the Philippine Commission to the date when such expenses were paid out of the Philippine Treasury.

2. A statement of the amount of money paid by the United States for or on account of railway transportation for troops to and from the Philippine Islands since the ratification of the treaty of peace between the United States and Spain, and the several railway companies to which it was paid and the sums paid each of them.

3. A statement of the amount of money expended and the amount, as far as he is able to state the same, for which the Government of the United States is liable, remaining unpaid, for equipment, supplies, and military operations in the Philippine Islands each year from May 1, 1898, to the present time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Let the resolution go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will go over under objection.

#### EXPENSES OF NAVAL OPERATIONS IN THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. CULBERSON. I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, directed to send to the Senate a statement of the amount of money expended, and the amount, so far as he is able to state the same, for which the Government of the United States is liable, remaining unpaid, for equipment, transportation, supplies, and naval operations in the Philippine Islands each year from May 1, 1898, to the present time.

Mr. BEVERIDGE and Mr. KEAN. Let it go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will go over.



## THE NICARAGUA CANAL.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I had a conference yesterday with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], in which he said that the Philippine-government bill would succeed the bill that is to be voted on to-day; that he expected it would be made the regular order of the Senate for to-morrow, but he would yield to another Senator after the bill was taken up for business connected with the District of Columbia.

I wish to give notice that on to-morrow, after the conclusion of the routine morning business, I shall ask the Senate for leave to make some observations on the Nicaragua Canal, which will occupy probably from an hour to an hour and a half.

## PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. W. H. CROOK, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 15th instant approved and signed the following acts:

An act (S. 2442) confirming title to the State of Nebraska of certain selected indemnity school lands; and

An act (S. 3513) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Parkville, Mo.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. C. R. McKENNEY, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (S. 181) granting an increase of pension to William C. David;

A bill (S. 201) granting a pension to Jane K. Hill;

A bill (S. 721) granting an increase of pension to Lavalette D. Dickey;

A bill (S. 951) granting an increase of pension to Charles Ambrook;

A bill (S. 952) granting an increase of pension to George H. Smith;

A bill (S. 1285) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Steele;

A bill (S. 1678) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Wingfield;

A bill (S. 2063) granting a pension to Ida S. McKinley;

A bill (S. 2079) granting an increase of pension to William Wheeler;

A bill (S. 2327) granting an increase of pension to William Hoag;

A bill (S. 2329) granting an increase of pension to Peter Bittman;

A bill (S. 2877) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of Thomas Blackburn;

A bill (S. 3064) granting an increase of pension to Emma Sophia Harper Cilley;

A bill (S. 3103) granting an increase of pension to Susan Hays;

A bill (S. 3378) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Anne Harris;

A bill (S. 3388) granting an increase of pension to John Peterson;

A bill (S. 3390) granting an increase of pension to Charles Allen;

A bill (S. 3849) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. H. Luce;

A bill (S. 3995) granting a pension to Susan E. Clark;

A bill (S. 4022) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Brown;

A bill (S. 4404) granting an increase of pension to Otto H. Haselmann;

A bill (S. 4414) granting an increase of pension to Albertine Schoenecker;

A bill (S. 4643) granting an increase of pension to Pheobe L. Peyton; and

A bill (H. R. 11354) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903.

## CHINESE EXCLUSION.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2960, the Chinese-exclusion bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2960) to prohibit the coming into and to regulate the residence within the United States, its Territories, and all possessions and all territory under its jurisdiction, and the District of Columbia, of Chinese persons and persons of Chinese descent.

Mr. TURNER obtained the floor.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll; and, after a delay of some minutes, the following Senators answered to their names:

Allison,	Cullom,	Kean,	Quay,
Bacon,	Dietrich,	Kittredge,	Simon,
Bard,	Dillingham,	McLaurin, Miss.,	Stewart,
Berry,	Fairbanks,	McMillan,	Taliaferro,
Beveridge,	Foster, La.,	Martin,	Teller,
Burnham,	Frye,	Millard,	Turner,
Burrows,	Gibson,	Mitchell,	Warren,
Clapp,	Hale,	Money,	Wellington,
Clark, Mont.,	Hanna,	Morgan,	Wetmore.
Clark, Wyo.,	Harris,	Patterson,	
Cockrell,	Heitfeld,	Pettus,	
Culbertson,	Jones, Ark.	Proctor,	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Forty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. President, during the speech of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] yesterday, in answer to the taunt made in his statement that it was extraordinary that I should show so much bitterness toward the Republican party, I said that it was because I had been cozened by that party for thirty years. I can not permit this answer, given on the spur of the moment more in jest than in earnest, to stand as a serious expression of my views.

I have no feeling of bitterness toward the Republican party of Abraham Lincoln and Ulysses S. Grant, nor do I believe that that party ever cozened anybody. So long as those great men were the leaders of that party, so long as the principles which they stood for animated that party, so long as the slightest shred of principle which they ever stood for animated that party, I was a loyal, ardent, and consistent follower of it. The Republican party in that day stood for human rights. Abraham Lincoln declared that it was brought into existence to bring this Government back to the principles and the practices of Thomas Jefferson, and I believe that the Republican party of that day was as truly the exponent of the principles of Thomas Jefferson as I believe that the Democratic party of this day is the exponent of the principles of Thomas Jefferson.

But it would be a brave man who would assert and undertake to establish that the Republican party of to-day has anything in common with the Republican party of Abraham Lincoln's day. That great man, if he could come back to earth, would not recognize it as the party which honored him and which he honored in the high office to which it elevated him; that party which to-day finds the principal ground for its existence in the exercise of boundless extravagance and gross favoritism in government; which has had its sentiment so shriveled and shrunken that on all occasions it prefers the dollar to the man, and which has so little regard for liberty and the sacred principles upon which our free institutions are founded that at this moment it is endeavoring to drown in a sea of human blood the aspirations of a friendly and an allied people for liberty and independence.

I followed that party as long as I could; I followed it longer than I ought to have done because of the associations which clustered around it; but the time came when conscience pointed in one direction and the Republican party pointed in another, and I followed my conscience. I have never had any occasion, Mr. President, to regret the course which I pursued in leaving the Republican party. When the scales have fallen from one's eyes he can see more clearly than he did before, and I see to-day that all idealism, all sentimentality in favor of human liberty has departed from the Republican party, and that it is gross and material in all its instincts. It stands to-day not for a pure and simple administration of this Government in the interest of the common people of the land, but it stands for the material interests of the nation, for the corporations, for the trusts, and for the enormous aggregations of capital which come to the halls of Congress and demand exceptional legislation in their favor. It does not stand, as it did in the day of Abraham Lincoln, for the rights of the common people of the land.

I did not imagine, as the Senator from Wisconsin said, that when I left the Republican party all virtue had departed from that party. I have some old-fashioned notions that the Government of the United States was established to conserve the interests of the American people rather than the interests of wealth and the organizations which have been formed to promote the aggregation of wealth. I have some old-fashioned ideas that it is our duty here to legislate for the people rather than to legislate, by gross favoritism, for the building up of a few enormous fortunes in the United States. The only thing that I have imagined in connection with my departure from the Republican party was that I saw the tendencies of the Republican party more clearly than do some of my friends upon the other side, so that I was enabled to break away from my attachments to that party, which were very strong indeed, and which holds some of my friends on the other side, I believe, contrary to—I will not say contrary to their convictions, but at the expense of many misgivings upon their part concerning the course which that party is pursuing.

And upon the part of nobody on the other side do I find those misgivings more clearly shadowed forth than in the utterances and the actions of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, who taunted me by saying that I thought all virtue had departed from the Republican party when I left that organization.

I find that in his utterances against the wicked and unconscionable and unconstitutional course which his party is pursuing toward the Philippine Islands and in the reluctance which he has shown to follow that party in that course; I find that in his action upon the ship-subsidy bill, in connection with which the Republican party ran its arms down into the Treasury of the United States up to the armpits for the purpose of favoring the protected and the exceptional interests of capital invested in the shipping industry, and I believe firmly that if the Republican party goes on in the course which it is pursuing, showing a contempt for the just rights and interests of the people of the land, indicating, as plainly as it has been doing for the last few years, that the only thought that exists in the breast of its leadership is the conservation of wealth in this country, that these misgivings which I find in the breasts of some of my friends on the other side will continue to grow, and that they will see their conscientious duty in the same way that I saw mine when I left that Republican party, because I could not approve of the course it was pursuing and which I saw it was determined to continue to pursue.

The Senator from Wisconsin complained that I impugned the motives of Senators on the other side of the Chamber because I said they had been actuated by politics in the consideration of this measure. Mr. President, I do not consider that I have impugned the motives of any Senator upon the other side. I was particularly careful to disclaim any reflection upon the motives of any Senator upon the other side. I simply asserted that they were following the ingrained tendencies of Republican policies when they had permitted sentiment to be crystallized upon the other side in opposition to the enactment of this just and wise and well-conceived measure reported by the Committee on Immigration for the purpose of carrying out the policy of this country against Chinese exclusion. I said that the policy of the Republican party was the conservation of wealth rather than the protection of the common people of the land, and that whenever wealth appealed to the Republican party any just measure designed for the protection of the people went down when it had upon it the dollar mark of disapprobation.

I also called attention to the fact that since the bill had been reported here we had been hearing from wealth upon the subject of the enactment of this measure. Their telegrams and petitions are presented here and laid upon the table every day, and some have even been presented this morning. The transcontinental railroads have had their agents here inveighing against this measure. The great shipping companies on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts have had their agents here inveighing against this measure. The business interests, the commercial interests, the trade interests affect to have been frightened by this measure. They have all exerted their influence to bring about the operation of this ingrained tendency of the Republican party to oppose everything which wealth wants defeated and to deny to the people everything which they want enacted.

Mr. President, if that is an impeachment of the motives of Senators, it is so because the facts stated are an impeachment of their motives, and nobody is to be held responsible for it simply because he refers to it. It is the facts themselves which constitute the impeachment, and they do so because they stamp disapprobation upon Republican policies and disapprobation upon Republican Senators who undertake to follow Republican policies.

I have had occasion to look through most of the speeches delivered in this Chamber upon this bill since it has been under consideration. I find the keynote of all of them to be the fact that we want to build up our trade with China; that the business interests are alarmed at the drastic features of this bill, and therefore, notwithstanding the strong appeals which are made to the Congress of the United States to enact this legislation, notwithstanding that the interests of civilization are bound up in our having adequate Chinese restriction laws, that the commercial interests are so preponderant in the minds of our friends on the other side that the peoples' measure is to be laid aside in favor of a halfway measure which has no merit except that it meets the approval of those interests.

I shall read briefly from the speech of my distinguished friend from Ohio, which I had occasion to refer to yesterday, to show the views which appear to be most potent in governing his action upon this bill. The Senator from Ohio in that speech said:

We have reached in the progress of our development a point where we not only supply our home markets with what we manufacture and what we produce on our farms and out of our mines, but we have a great surplus to sell, which we must sell in the markets of the world. We have been looking across the Atlantic to Europe for markets, and we will continue to look here. But in Europe they will take from us only what little, in addition to what they can produce for themselves, that they may want, and that is not enough to exhaust our surplus.

We must look elsewhere, to the whole world—and particularly to the Far East, now that we have a base of operations in the Philippines—to China, Japan, Oceania, the Straits Settlements, and southern India. They have there a thousand millions of people who are just beginning to learn that they want and must have—if they would keep pace, even in their own way, with the progress of the world—that which we produce, both to wear and to use and to eat.

In China, therefore, the greatest of all the countries to which I have referred, is the greatest opportunity for the development of a market that the world affords to-day. It has been said there are 400,000,000 Chinamen. You might just as well say there are 600,000,000. Nobody knows. It is all guesswork. There has been no census, but nobody says there are less than 400,000,000 to 450,000,000 Chinamen. What is the trade of China? It is only a few years since she began to trade with the world. Already her foreign trade amounts to more than \$100,000,000, but out of it all, whatever it may be—and I do not want to go into figures and quote them—we sell there less than 10 per cent, I believe, of what she buys. Why should we sell to China only 10 per cent?

And in pursuance of this idea that we ought to develop our trade with China and that we ought to be very careful how we tread upon her toes in the violation of any of our treaty obligations, I find the Senator from Ohio making this most remarkable proposition. He reads a letter from the Chinese minister to the Secretary of State for the purpose of supporting his construction of the treaty of 1894, which shows that the Chinese version of the treaty of 1894 is different from the version delivered to the American representative, and now on file in the Department of State, and upon this statement of the Chinese minister, to the effect that there are other words in the Chinese version than those which are in the English version, the Senator predicates his remarkable proposition that all Chinamen, except laborers, are entitled to come into this country under and by virtue of the treaty of 1894.

Who has read anything concerning the duplicity of oriental statesmen, who has read the many instances in which in their cunning and deceit they have interpolated provisions into their own copy of treaties which did not appear in the copies of those with whom they were treating, that does not know, if there be any difference in the wording of the Chinese treaty between the copies written in Chinese and the copies written in English, that it is an instance of the duplicity of Chinese character, and that it does not and ought not to militate at all against the force and effect of that version written in English? Acting upon the Chinese version, however, which the Senator from Ohio accepted without any question, simply because of the statement of the Chinese minister, the Senator makes this remarkable proposition:

In other words, Mr. President, only laborers are prohibited, and all other classes have a right to come and here reside. I call attention in this connection to the fact that they are not required by this treaty to come here to follow here their avocations in China. A merchant in China has a right to come here because he is a merchant. His right to come is not to be restricted to a case where he wants to become a merchant in the United States.

A man who is a student within the accepted meaning of that term has a right to come here, not because there is some particular study he wants to pursue in the United States, but because he is a student. And so it is with every other class named. The publicist is not, if he is within the exempted class, to be allowed to come here because he wants here to practice statesmanship, but because of his character.

That being our treaty stipulation, I say that whenever a man who belongs to any class not a laborer comes to one of our ports with a certificate from his government, viséed by our consular representative in China, he has a right to admission without any more ado about it, and no Congress—unless we want to violate and disregard our treaty obligations, which, of course, we have the power to do—not even the Congress, unless we want to do that, certainly no Treasury official, has a right, in the name of making regulations, to disregard and override it.

The proposition is, as urged by the Senator from Ohio, that any Chinaman who can get a certificate from the Chinese officials that he is not a laborer, and who can procure that certificate to be viséed by the consular representative of the United States in China, has the right to come here upon those papers, and that neither Congress, nor the Secretary of the Treasury, nor any other executive officer of the Government, has a right to require any other evidence of his good faith with respect to the character in which he pretends to come here. And that, I take it, Mr. President, is the reason why our friends upon the other side want to emasculate these provisions from this bill which experience has shown to be necessary, and which the Secretary of the Treasury, out of the experience of that Department, has formulated into the shape of Treasury regulations.

Mr. President, the reason for the outcry against these necessary regulations, which go beyond the treaty, but which are not in opposition to the treaty, because designed for the purpose of requiring a fair and just execution of the treaty, is based upon the idea that we have no right to supplement the treaty provisions at all, but are to be remitted to the tender mercies of the Chinese Government and to the action of our own consuls in China, under all of the difficulties under which they must labor there in attempting to carry out their duties.

This fails to take account of the duplicity of the Chinese character, which everybody who has been in that country and who has written upon the subject tells us extends from the highest to the lowest. Even the Emperor of China is not exempt from this trait of duplicity. It is said that when England sent an embassy



to China in 1796 for the purpose of compelling the observance upon the part of that Government of its treaty stipulations with England the Chinese vessel which carried the envoys of England to the Chinese court had printed upon its flag the words "Tribute bearer from the country of England." It is said further that in 1873, when the envoys of the civilized countries had succeeded in forcing from the Chinese Government the concession that those envoys might be received in audience by the Emperor as the representatives of their several sovereigns and their several countries, they were received by the Emperor in what was called the "pavilion of light," an apartment used for giving audience to envoys from tributary States.

It is known that not only deception but corruption prevails from the highest to the lowest in the governmental service of China. Li Hung Chang, whose name was mentioned yesterday as one who would have been prohibited from coming into the country under the construction of the treaty which the friends of this bill advocate, who died only a few months ago, leaving one of the colossal fortunes of the world, and who was the chief minister of China for over forty years, is known to have amassed his immense fortune as the result of the corrupt use of his office.

With certificates permitting Chinamen and Chinawomen to enter into this country worth anywhere from \$500 to \$1,500 or \$3,000, as my friend from Idaho [Mr. HEITFIELD] suggests, if the gates are to be thrown open upon the mere certificate of these Chinese officials, we might just as well have no Chinese exclusion.

The Senator from Wisconsin thought we had suffered no bad results by the execution of the present law, and therefore that the substitute proposed by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] was amply sufficient for the future carrying out of our policy of Chinese exclusion, and he criticised those here who undertook to impeach the correctness of the recent census returns upon the subject of the Chinese population of this country. Mr. President, it has not been the Senators in favor of this bill who have inveighed against the correctness of the census returns. It was the Treasury officials themselves who came before the Immigration Committee and told that committee that those returns were not correct, and that, whereas those returns showed that there were only 93,000 Chinamen in the United States, their information led them to believe that there were more than 300,000 Chinamen in the United States, and that they were here as the result of frauds perpetrated upon the Government by Chinamen who were, in fact, laborers, but who had come to the country under other guises and under other designations.

Mr. President, I must hurry on and conclude what I have to say, because I do not wish to discommode other Senators who wish to take the floor. I was very much gratified that the Senator from Wisconsin—for whom I have a very high regard and whose kindly expressions toward me I heartily reciprocate—I am very much gratified to have his opinion, that my contention concerning the true construction of the treaty of 1894 was the correct construction, and to have him coincide with the view that those Chinamen only might be admitted into the United States who belong to the classes specifically enumerated in the treaty, to wit: Officials, teachers, students, merchants, and travelers for curiosity or pleasure, because that admission takes the sting out of ninety-nine one-hundredths of all that has been said in this Chamber against the enactment of this measure as it comes from the committee. This is true, because that measure does nothing except to formulate into the shape of statutory provisions the clauses of the treaty, with the necessary Treasury regulations enacted into law to carry them into effect, or, speaking more accurately, to give it honest and effective enforcement.

I took occasion to point out on yesterday a number of reasons why the Platt substitute could not take the place of this well-considered measure reported by the committee, but there was one reason I did not then mention and which I now desire to call to the attention of the Senate.

That substitute has been amended from time to time so that many of the objections urged to it have ceased to have force. But this objection has not ceased to have force, and that is that that amendment does not take account of the right of the seamen of this country to the same protection for their labor that all other labor has received under the protection policy of the Government. Why is it that this most important and deserving class of labor in this country is brushed aside in this way? Why is it that they are to be put upon the level of the Mongolian in the matter of their wages?

Our Republican friends say they are the friends of labor, that their policy has been to build up labor, that they want to conserve it and upbuild and uplift it in every possible way. Why, then, is it, my Republican friends, that you insist upon dropping the American seaman down to the level of the Mongolian seaman? Why is it you refuse to give him the protection he insists he ought to have in the American merchant marine? What reason is there for it?

I have not heard a single reason urged in this Chamber, except the telegrams and letters which have been read here from day to

day from the merchant shipowners to the effect that this would involve them in great hardship in competition with vessels of foreign nations. But is it not a fact that this Chamber has just passed a measure which undertook to equalize those hardships? Is it not a fact that that measure proceeded very largely upon the theory that it was necessary by reason of the larger wages which were paid to American seamen to give our ships a subsidy to enable them to compete with the ships of other countries? This did not prevail as to the Pacific coast, because our shipping there employ Chinese the same as the ships of other countries. If they are to be permitted to go on in the employment of Chinese crews at Chinese wages, they would receive for nothing the subsidy which you propose to give them. There is no doubt about that. They are going to get a subsidy under the terms of the bill which lately passed this Chamber and which will undoubtedly pass the other House that will more than compensate any inequality even between American seamen and European seamen. They are going to get a subsidy which is not necessary by reason of any inequality in the wages of seamen upon the Pacific coast.

Why is it that the rights of American seamen should be dropped out of this bill and that it should be enacted in a shape utterly regardless of their interest? I confess I can see no reason for it. Every reason urged in favor of the ship-subsidy bill exists to-day in favor of the retention of the merchant-seaman clause in the bill now under consideration. The rights of our seamen; the interest of the traveling public, who are entitled to be protected by the employment of efficient seamen upon these great ocean carriers; the building up of an American merchant marine for the education of American sailors, who can man our war ships in time of war, demand it. Everything demands it; and yet it has been determined that it shall go out of this bill simply upon the ipse dixit of the shipowners.

Mr. President, two telegrams were read this morning from shipping interests in the city of Seattle, in my own State. I hold in my hand a clipping from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of April 9 in which I find the views of the shipmasters of Seattle stated in a way different from that in which it was stated in the two telegrams, and I should like to read this clipping and then conclude my remarks. The paper says:

The contention of Congressmen HITT and CANNON that the passage of the exclusion bill, with the amendment providing that Chinese shall not be employed on vessels of American register, will drive the American ships on the Pacific under the British flag is not supported by local marine men.

This is a Republican paper from which I am reading.

With one noteworthy exception, all who were questioned anent the claim of the two Congressmen yesterday promptly declared it to be incorrect.

Capt. E. E. Caine, of the Pacific Clipper Line: "Such talk on the part of any Congressman is utter nonsense. Almost all of the Chinese employed on American vessels are cooks. I would prefer that the lines had not been drawn quite so close, because it frequently happens that it is a difficult matter to get other cooks. But to claim that American ships on the Pacific will go under the British flag on account of the enactment of such a law is nonsense, pure and simple."

C. W. Miller, assistant general agent of the Pacific Coast Steamship Company: "The Pacific Coast Steamship Company employs a few Chinese cooks on the steamers running to Alaskan points. It sometimes happens that on the boats running between here and San Francisco there are a few Chinese laborers. At other times there are none in our employ. I think the claim of Congressmen HITT and CANNON absurd in every way. I fail to see where they can bring forward a single legitimate argument showing that their contention will materialize with such a law in operation. I think but few American vessels on the coast employ Chinese labor. So far as American shipping is concerned, the law will do no damage whatever."

Capt. John B. Libby, of the Puget Sound Tug Boat Company: "The claim of those opposed to the passage of the amendment is ridiculous. American ships on the Pacific are not manned by Chinese. A great many of them employ Chinese cooks, because they are trustworthy. If the proposition that American ships can not be manned without employing Chinese is true, we would better shut up shop. I would be one of the first to get out of the business."

L. H. Gray, agent of the Pollard Line: "It is perfect nonsense to advance any such argument against the bill as was made by Messrs. CANNON and HITT. Both those estimable gentlemen would do well to come out here and study conditions for a short while. A good many Chinese cooks are employed aboard American ships, but many white and colored men could do just as good work."

Capt. J. F. Trowbridge, of the Pacific Clipper Line: "I think the amendment to the exclusion bill is a good provision. The talk about American ships being driven under the British flag is childlike. A few Chinese cooks are employed on the American vessels plying the waters of the Pacific, but that is about the limit."

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. TURNER. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I have listened with attention to all the quotations the Senator from Washington has read, and I wish to ask him if they do not all refer to our coastwise trade? Is there a single reference there made to any trans-Pacific line or ship?

Mr. TURNER. I think one or two of the lines referred to are engaged in the foreign trade, and others have reference to American vessels in the domestic trade. But these gentlemen are all intelligent men, and they knew what they were referring to. Their opinion was sought by this newspaper because they were familiar with shipping and were familiar with the effect which this measure would have upon our foreign shipping. While some of them may refer to the employment of Chinese upon lines engaged in the coastwise trade, the opinion which they gave had



reference to the employment of Chinese upon American ships engaged in the foreign trade.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do not question the intelligence of the gentlemen who are quoted, but listening with attention to the quotations, as I have to the remarks of the Senator, and as I always do, I observe that they have reference to our coastwise trade, and that the companies whose officers were quoted were all coasting companies, and that not one of them referred to our trans-Pacific trade. If that is true, then the quotations are not in point, since it is not insisted, of course, that our coastwise trade would be driven under a foreign flag. It could not be, since there is an absolute prohibition against any coastwise ship sailing under a foreign flag.

Mr. TURNER. Undoubtedly the gentlemen quoted had reference to our ships engaged in the foreign trade being driven under the foreign flag.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. But they do not say so. They refer and even mention twice the coastwise trade.

Mr. TURNER. You could not drive our ships engaged in the domestic trade under a foreign flag.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Of course not.

Mr. TURNER. Foreign ships can not engage in that trade.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Therefore, the quotation is beside the point.

Mr. TURNER. Manifestly these gentlemen, who are all intelligent men, whose opinions were asked simply because they were engaged in the shipping trade and might be supposed to have knowledge concerning the effect of this amendment upon that trade, whether foreign or domestic, had reference in the statements which they make here to the effect of this amendment upon ships under American registry engaged in the foreign trade.

But, Mr. President, I have taken up more time than I ought to have done, and will conclude.

Mr. QUAY. Mr. President, I rise to ask what is the order as to the offering and discussion of amendments to the pending bill. I have an amendment to offer, as the Senate knows, which I regard as important. I do not desire to speak upon the bill; that is for the senior wranglers of the Senate, to whose utterances I am always ready to listen with the greatest of pleasure. I always sit at their feet to drink in the words that fall from their superior wisdom. But I desire, bearing upon the question of the admission of Christian Chinese and of the gallant Chinese soldiers who fought in defense of the American legation and American men and women, and who defended the Pe Tang Cathedral, to have read some pages from recent works describing the defense of the legations in China. It may occupy a little more than five minutes, which is, I understand, the time allotted. If that is the case, I wish to say that I will ask the Senate—and I do not often occupy its time, as the Senators all know—to give me a little more than the time allotted under the order, which was made when I was not present.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. The Senator will have five minutes on his own amendment.

Mr. QUAY. Five minutes? I will probably require ten. I will not in personal remarks consume more than one minute; but the chapters I desire to have read may occupy from five to ten minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On one amendment the Senator can occupy five minutes; when another amendment is offered he can, if he is recognized, occupy five minutes more; but to occupy more than five minutes on one amendment by one Senator would be against the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. FORAKER. I suggest to the Senator that he read his chapters now.

Mr. QUAY. I am ready now to say what I have to say in a few moments, but I do not wish to interfere with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON], who has given notice that he desires to speak to the bill.

Mr. FORAKER. I beg pardon. I was not aware of that.

Mr. QUAY. The Senate understands the situation.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, before the debate closes I wish for a short time to occupy the floor to recur to what is known as the Platt amendment, and to show, if I can, why it should not be adopted and why the bill as reported from the committee should receive the practically unanimous vote of this Chamber.

Entirely independent of the devious and uncertain way in which laws are to be continued in force, the omission of certain provisions material to the proper exclusion of Chinese labor from the United States and the territory of the United States is a full and complete reason why the Platt amendment should not be adopted. We may congratulate ourselves, however, that the result of the debate has been to force the advocates of the Platt amendment to the acceptance of certain provisions to which I am inclined to think they are at heart opposed, but without which they could see no hope of carrying their measure.

The omission to which I particularly refer is a clause that pro-

hibits the ingoing of Chinese into the Philippine Islands. The last amendment accepted prohibits Chinese coming from the Philippine Islands to the United States, but it is entirely silent as to the going of Chinese from China or other lands into the Philippine Islands.

Whatever the motive of Senators may have been in omitting this very material clause, I am inclined to think that those outside of this Chamber who have urged its omission have a very well-defined and determined purpose in the omission, which is, Mr. President, to leave the Philippine Islands in such a condition that they may be exploited by the aid of unlimited Chinese labor, no matter what the result may be to the native inhabitants of the islands and to the honor and welfare of the United States.

In this connection I desire to read what General MacArthur has said upon the subject, so that the Senate may not for a moment suppose that it is a note of alarm originating either with myself or this side of the Chamber. General MacArthur, in one of his annual reports to the War Department, makes the following statement:

Such a people—

Referring to the Chinese—

Such a people, largely endowed as they are, with inexhaustible fortitude and determination, if admitted to the archipelago in any considerable numbers during the formative period which is now in progress of evolution, would soon have direct or indirect control of pretty nearly every productive interest, to the absolute exclusion alike of Filipinos and Americans.

And then he continues:

This view is stated with considerable emphasis, as unmistakable indications are apparent of organized and systematized efforts to break down all barriers, with a view to unrestricted Chinese immigration, for the purpose of quick and effective exploitation of the islands—a policy which would not only be ruinous to the Filipino people, but would in the end surely defeat the expansion of American trade to its natural dimensions in what is obviously one of its most important channels.

In this connection it may not be improper to state that one of the greatest difficulties attending military efforts to tranquilize the people of the archipelago arises from their dread of sudden and excessive exploitation, which they fear would defraud them of their natural patrimony and at the same time relegate them to a status of social and political inferiority.

I ask the members of this body whether the exclusion from the United States by the Platt amendment of Chinese coming from the Philippine Islands, and the omission to exclude them from the Philippine Islands coming from China or other foreign countries, is not the equivalent of a notice to the Philippine Commission and the American authorities in the islands that the policy of exclusion from the islands is looked upon with disfavor by the party in power; and that the barriers there should be thrown down, so that there may be no obstacle to the inroad of Chinese from across the sea?

I can see no other motive upon the part of those outside of this Chamber in excluding from the United States Chinese coming from the Philippine Islands and remaining silent upon the invasion of the Philippine Islands by Chinese from their own country, than that it shall be given out as the policy of the United States that the Philippine Islands are to be left open to the invasion, in order that when the time for exploitation comes it may be rapid and effective through the agency of Chinese labor.

Mr. President, we could not commit a more indefensible act during this formative period in the Philippine Islands, when the destiny of the islands is as yet unsettled, when it is undetermined whether the islands shall be permanently annexed to the United States or whether they may have a government of their own, than to flood their country with a people they hate, with a people who will practically drive them from the possession of their land and their trade and commerce.

I wish to call the attention of some of the Senators on this side of the Chamber to the fact that the effect of the last amendment to the Platt substitute is to prevent them from voting for the substitute. I listened to the eloquent and incisive argument of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], stating why he could not vote for the committee bill. It was because it prohibited the Chinese from coming from the Philippine Islands to the United States.

The Platt amendment as it now exists prohibits Chinese from coming from the Philippine Islands into the United States, and the honored Senator from Missouri and those who may have been opposed with him to the committee's bill for that reason can not vote for the Platt substitute now by reason of that amendment.

But, Mr. President, I can not take any longer time upon that proposition. I desire to devote what remains of the time which it has been agreed I shall occupy to that clause of the measure which excludes Chinese sailors from American ships in foreign trade.

I call attention to the significant fact that every class of American labor except that of seamanship has been protected by Congressional legislation in three different ways, and that the seaman is not only abandoned to his fate, but American shipowners are invited to go into the cheapest markets of the world to man their ships with the cheapest and meanest sailor labor that can be found in any of its ports.

It is claimed by the friends of the present tariff that protection



protects every laborer within the United States, whatever branch of it he may follow. Let us, for the sake of the argument, admit that that is true. Then we have a law upon the statute books which excludes what is known as contract foreign labor from the shores of the United States, ostensibly for the benefit of all the labor within our country. Then we have the Chinese-exclusion law, which prohibits Chinese laborers from contesting for the bread of life with American laborers.

All these laws are for the benefit of labor within the limits of the United States, but when we turn to the sailor we find that he is protected by none of them. The so-called protection policy of the Republican party can not protect him. On the contrary, in the purchase of whatever he needs he contributes to the Treasury for the purpose of subsidizing ships from which by legislation he is excluded.

In addition to that, Mr. President, by section 20 of an act of Congress entitled "An act to remove certain burdens on the American merchant marine and encourage the American foreign carrying trade, and for other purposes," approved June 26, 1884, known as the Dingley shipping act, it is expressly provided:

That every master of a vessel in the foreign trade may engage any seaman at any port out of the United States, in the manner provided by law, to serve for one or more round trips from and to the port of departure, or for a definite time, whatever the destination.

So we see that not only is the labor of seamanship not protected by the law excluding foreign contract labor, but American ship masters are advised to go to foreign ports wherever they can find sailor labor cheap and mean enough to suit their purposes, and with that labor to man their vessels, opening the ports of the United States to this contract foreign sailor labor to the exclusion of the American and the Caucasian sailor.

Mr. CLAY. Will the Senator from Colorado allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. PATTERSON. Certainly.

Mr. CLAY. I desire to ask the Senator whether, under the provisions of the bill, if it is passed, Chinamen who are legally entitled now to be in this country could procure employment on our ships, and I ask the Senator if a crew were to strike in China, under the provisions of this bill, the master of the ship would be authorized to employ a crew in China for the purpose of bringing the ship back?

Mr. PATTERSON. As to the first part of the Senator's question, Can Chinamen within the limits of the United States man American vessels under the provisions of the proposed law, I would say no, because they are not citizens of this country. They are yet subjects of their own Government across the ocean, and there is no reason why any exception should be made in their favor above those who have not come to this country.

As to the other part of the question, the bill fully and amply provides for the manning of American vessels with Chinese sailors if an emergency requires it. If by reason of a striking crew or the loss of a crew in any other legitimate way the vessel can not reach an American port without the aid of Chinese sailors, then for the purpose of bringing the vessel into port Chinese sailors may be employed and used. So that the objection which has been made to this clause upon the ground that American ships might be stranded, as it were, across the ocean does not exist.

Mr. President, I have wondered why it is that gentlemen upon the other side are so solicitous about the American flag flying at American mastsheads. We discover that there are but two methods by which they are willing to hoist American flags upon American ships.

One is by means of a subsidy, the using of money paid into the Treasury by the people of the country as taxes to rich shipowners, to enable them to make the greater profit by such ships as they are willing to sail under the American flag, and the other method is by driving out and from the sea American and Caucasian sailors and manning American ships with the cheapest seamen that can be procured the world over. If they can have American ships with American registry and floating the American flag by either the one or the other of these methods, then they welcome the flag; otherwise they do not want it.

Mr. President, we all know that if to see the American flag on the mast of an American ship is a delight to the eyes of the American people the world over, all that Congress has to do is to repeal our present shipping laws, a relic of barbarism—laws that have been rejected by almost every other nation upon the face of the globe—and allow American capital to be invested in ships over which will be raised the American flag and that will sail under American papers.

No, Mr. President, a plan so simple as that will not do. One of the two methods or both must be adopted, either to tax the people that those who are willing to sail ships may be paid the taxes, or to drive from the ships of the country the manly, the able, and the worthy American and Caucasian sailor.

I assert, Mr. President, that we want American ships flying the American flag and manned by American sailors. The Amer-

ican flag or any flag, after all, is but a piece of cloth. It may be cut and sewed together in stripes of red, white, and blue.

You may put upon its field the stars. After all, what does it signify? Other nations have flags with colors of red, white, and blue, fashioned with red stripes and stars, and such flags emblemize in many instances all that is mean and cowardly in government. A flag is only to be revered as it emblemizes that which the human heart aspires to—that emblemizes manhood and liberty and law.

So far as our flag is concerned, Mr. President, if it is to be at the head of our armies that invade other people's countries to subjugate their populations, to subject their people to torture, under its folds to burn down towns and cities—if our flag is to be raised at the mastsheads of ships manned by a yellow-skinned and white-livered peon race, then it is better that our flag be taken down and cleansed, and that it be again unfurled to emblemize that of which the American nation are proud, to let it again kiss the breeze and meet the gaze of the downtrodden, of the oppressed of every nation, who see in the American flag an invitation to come to our shores, where they will be met with extended arms and live upon equality and be protected by the never-dying proposition that all men are created equal, and that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the Platt amendment will be voted down. It is insufficient. It does not meet the demands either of the American people or of American labor. It leaves the Philippine Islands to be despoiled by those who are now waiting to invade its soil and take from their inhabitants their rightful possessions, the property by means of which they expect to live, and it discourages American seamanship and mans our ships with sailors whose only merit is that of cheapness and who can not be depended upon in a time of emergency.

I speak not only for the Pacific coast sailor, but I speak for the sailor of the Atlantic coast. When the isthmian canal is built, and I sincerely trust it will not be long before that great work is accomplished, Atlantic steamers will be sailing from Atlantic seaports to the ports of China, and unless this clause is upon the statute books you will find the ships of the Atlantic and the Southern ports manned by the yellow sailor, and the comparatively few white sailors now upon the ocean will be driven from the occupation.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. President, I had not intended to take any part in the discussion of this Chinese puzzle until within a day or two. I have been in receipt of numerous telegrams, some of which I have presented to the Senate. There seems to be an anxiety in the minds of some men as to where I stand upon this proposition. Therefore I thought it best in my own interest to tell the people and save postage and the answering of telegrams.

I have in my hand one of numerous telegrams which have been sent to me in which there is great similarity. This one says, "We insist upon your supporting the Chinese-exclusion bill in every essential feature." The phrase "every essential feature" is in nearly every telegram, which is self-explanatory as emanating from one fountain head.

I am going to support the essential features of this bill, but I reserve the right to define for myself what is meant by the essential features. The essential feature of this bill is that the law which has for years protected the workmen of the United States from Chinese labor shall be reenacted. There is not a member of this body who has spoken upon the subject but has laid that down as the essential feature of this bill, to accomplish which we may differ as to the method. I have my own ideas upon that subject.

The essential feature as given to me by representatives of the interests that we are seeking to protect, by a committee who waited upon me, was that what they wanted was an extension of the Geary Act. I am in favor of the extension of the Geary Act carried by the Platt amendment, which to my mind covers the whole ground, provides for all emergencies, and absolutely protects the workmen of the United States. It goes further, Mr. President; it protects the dignity and integrity of this Republic.

Senators may claim that there is no violation of our treaty with China in the verbiage of this bill, but I for one, a layman, who have listened to the arguments upon that proposition as if I sat upon a jury under oath, can testify that in my belief some of the provisions of the bill are in direct violation of our treaty agreements. Therefore, after protecting, to the fullest extent that law can carry it, the rights and interests of the American workmen, certainly we can appeal to the patriotism of American citizens and the Congress of the United States to protect the dignity of the nation.

In giving attention to the origin and construction of this measure, I received from the Treasury Department within a day or two the following:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, April 12, 1902.

MY DEAR SIR: With reference to the part taken and services rendered by Mr. Dunn in connection with the draft of the new Chinese-exclusion act, I



have to state that Mr. Powderly advises me that in November last, after a conference with my predecessor, Mr. Dunn was requested to come to Washington for consultation, and that after his arrival the various phases of the existing Chinese-exclusion act and the many issues growing out of its administration were thoroughly gone over and a bill prepared by Mr. Richard Campbell, of the Bureau, assisted by Mr. Dunn. He was then informed that his services were no longer required by the Department.

Thereupon the Pacific coast delegation in Congress asked that he might be permitted to remain for purposes of consultation. This request was granted. After the Senate and House bills were presented it was again suggested to Mr. Dunn that he return to the Pacific coast. Then the Senate Committee on Immigration requested that he be permitted to remain, and he has since then been at their service. Mr. Dunn has never and does not represent the Department, and his presence at this time is a courtesy extended to the various committees having the matter in charge in Congress.

Very truly, yours,

L. M. SHAW.

Hon. M. A. HANNA,  
United States Senate.

Mr. Dunn, as an expert and an officer of the Government, holding the position of Chinese inspector at San Francisco, was sent for by the Treasury Department last fall to furnish such evidence and testimony as he might be able to give that would aid in the construction of a law which was to take the place of the one about to expire. The statement was made yesterday that had it not been for that circumstance—the expiration of the law by limitation—this question would not have been mooted at the present session of Congress. That is most probably true.

Therefore Mr. Dunn's presence here in obedience to orders from the Department was to aid in the construction of a new law, and as far as his evidence was required by the officials of the Department in the construction of such a law he was used to that effect and then told to go back. This letter states that he remained in an advisory capacity with the delegation from the Pacific coast, and later at the request of the Committee on Immigration of the Senate. He was not detailed to represent the Treasury Department of the United States Government, to sit at the executive sessions of the Committee on Immigration and make statements which have proven to be false, nor to make suggestions that would mislead the members of that committee in the construction of the details of the proposed law.

When this bill was reported from the Department of the Treasury it was supposed to cover every point, by the way of suggestion only, that the Department had to offer for the assistance of the committee of the Senate, and anything beyond that which the Committee on Immigration may choose to have adopted from any information obtainable was the work of the committee. All the information that was extracted from the man who was counseling them was misleading and in several cases not true. The committee are not to blame and can not be held responsible, and I here state, knowing the man and knowing the evidence which has come before the Senate, that Mr. Dunn is an unreliable witness and adviser. Now, I will read some extracts from Mr. Dunn's own statement:

I must first make a personal statement: Your committee was addressed in a previous hearing by an attorney for the Pacific Mail Company, who appeared before you under the halo of a great name, honored and respected by all Americans. The misfit of this halo was no more manifest than was the dual position assumed by this man in his conflicting representations before the committees of the House and Senate in the consideration of Chinese-exclusion legislation.

The name of the attorney was Mr. Evarts, the son of that distinguished statesman who has sat in this body and who has occupied the exalted position of Secretary of State, a worthy man and a worthy son of his father. This man speaks of the halo as if the son had smirched the reputation and honor of his father, which, according to Mr. Dunn's testimony, he has done by appearing as an attorney in the interest of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company. Suppose he did? He had a right to appear there. Mr. Dunn had no exclusive privileges before the committee. The Committee on Immigration were not bound to consider only the statements of this man, whose only prestige was that he was an officer of the United States Government. That sarcastic remark only reflects the character of the man. Mr. Dunn proceeds:

I have been requested to explain the reasons for my appointment to this service. Some four or five years ago, in the early part of McKinley's Administration, a commission of special agents was sent to San Francisco to investigate the alleged frauds perpetrated in the Chinese service, and as a result of a very searching investigation an exhaustive report was made which resulted in the resignation or dismissal of the inspector in charge of the Chinese bureau at that port. At that time I received a letter—which I am told is the only one of its kind ever sent from any department of the Government—stating, in effect, that my name was being considered for this position, which required certain stated qualifications, and continuing as follows: "It will be well for you to know that if you accept this position, and do your duty, you will make enemies of powerful interests who will undoubtedly smirch your character and seek to ruin you."

That letter from a department of the United States Government! Why does he not produce the letter? I disclaim that he ever received such a letter. The head of any department in the city of Washington could not be found who would ever dictate such a letter. The inference meant to be conveyed was that it came from the President of the United States because Mr. Dunn lived in his own county. If that be so, I deny it, and take the responsibility upon myself.

In spite of this warning I was fool enough to accept the position. Informed the President, however—

And there is the connection—

after considering all of the circumstances, that I did not care to go to San Francisco, but I was held to my promise. I then informed the President that I would accept "the position for six months, which was as long as anyone could be expected willingly to live in hades"—

My friend from California [Mr. PERKINS] is not in his seat. I should like to congratulate him—

that I had been in San Francisco some years before, knew something of the circumstances relating to Chinese matters, and considered that six months was as long as anyone could be asked to occupy the proposed position.

Mr. Dunn was a seeker after office within thirty days after the Administration of McKinley began in 1897, and continued as such until he accepted the first position that was offered him.

Now, were it not that there was gravity in the situation, that there was something above any personality, I would not at this time and place expose this situation, but knowing and believing that the Committee on Immigration were misled by the statements of this man, and in so much as some of the speakers on the other side have seen fit to drag politics into this question, disclaiming any intention of impugning the rights or the motives of anyone who appears here in behalf of labor, I propose to go to the root of this matter, and if the temperature of San Francisco is too high and has produced a feverish condition in the body and mind of Mr. Dunn, I suggest that he be sent to—well, say Nome.

Mr. KEAN. Guam.

Mr. HANNA. Guam would be a better place.

Because of my exceptional experience I was selected by the Treasury Department to assist in this work, with a view to urging only such legislation as will carry into the new law those administrative features which have been found effective and possible of enforcement. It is proper for me to say that the Treasury Department is taking no stand as to the principle involved, nor is it making any argument as to the advisability of excluding the Chinese. Very properly it leaves such matters to the legislative body, but seeks to have incorporated in any law which may be passed all such measures as may render it easy of enforcement.

I have heard from Mr. Gage, the ex-Secretary of the Treasury, and from Mr. Vanderlip, the ex-Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, both of whom state positively that they never in any way advised with this inspector nor sought his advice, nor would they consider his advice worth having in connection with such important legislation as this before us. The present Secretary of the Treasury has told me personally that he was not in accord with the provisions of this bill as to the execution of its provisions.

The Treasury Department do not advise that the regulations which have heretofore existed shall be enacted into statute law, and they give good reasons for it. Neither has the Secretary of State nor his Department been consulted in the construction of this proposed law, although the all-important question of a treaty is involved, and further, a commercial treaty with China, opening upon this new era conditions between the Orient and the United States, is now under consideration. But the deference was not paid to the Department of State that their advice should be sought in the formation of the bill.

No, Mr. President; this self-constituted agent and chairman of committee, Mr. Dunn—self-constituted I say because he can not show any authority for the information which he transmitted to the Committee on Immigration as coming from the Department of the Treasury—seems to be the chief adviser, and upon his representations of conditions, without regard to other testimony which followed, he is the only one who represents the Treasury Department in the discussion of this proposed law.

I repeat, in view of the charge he has made against a reputable firm of attorneys in San Francisco, which has been absolutely and unequivocally denied, his evidence is put out of court, in my judgment.

I want to refer for one moment to something said by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] in the course of his discussion of the bill. I am sorry that he is not present because I should like to ask him about the correctness of this language. His speech has not been printed, but, as I get it, he made this statement:

There is no question what the feeling among the great mass of American workmen is on this question, and if Senators have any doubt as to what their feeling is they can omit legislation on this subject and see what happens next autumn. My own impressions are that they will find out. I think the House has an impression in that direction too. They are going to run for election; we are not.

I am sorry that the Senator from Massachusetts has such an opinion of the workmen of this country. As a friend of that class I want, standing here, to resent the imputation that they would undertake to pass through Congress any legislation, that they would criticise differences of opinion that might arise in the debate, and that if the judgment of the United States Senate were not entirely in favor of a certain method of procedure in accomplishing their purpose, they would threaten a Senator with their vote. No, Mr. President, I would not forfeit my respect and confidence in the leaders of the great mass of workmen in the United States, knowing them as I do, by believing for one



moment that any such language has been used in the Capitol or outside of it, intended to be a threat or menace as to whether a Senator who would not vote as they dictated should afterwards receive their support.

There is but one section of this bill that has an interest for the workingman—no, I will not say that, but I will say they are interested in both questions. They are interested in protection for themselves, which they have a right to demand and which will be conceded to them unanimously, and they have a further right to raise their voice on behalf of their country and to insist that no provision of this bill shall carry with it an obligation which means that this nation has disregarded its promises and its covenants.

If we differ as to methods, that is fair and honest and debatable, it is only a question of method; and, therefore, in view of all the amendments which have been offered on this floor, if any part of this body decides that those arguments are convincing, that the best method is through the operation of the Platt amendment, have we not a right to vote our judgment without having it said that we are biased by dollars, without having politics injected into this question by the attempt to put upon the Republican party a responsibility which does not exist as to it, for, as I have stated before, it is only a question of protection to the workingmen and the upholding of our treaty stipulations.

I regret that any Senator should deal in such an argument and attempt to bring into this discussion the responsibilities of either the Republican or the Democratic party on a question that is absolutely nonpolitical, when it is understood and agreed that there is no man on the floor of this Chamber who is not in favor of the essential features of this bill.

Mr. President, I have already occupied more time than I intended. I had meant to stand here to-day and refute the insinuation that there is any disposition on the part of anyone on this side of the Chamber, Republican or otherwise, by vote this afternoon to indorse any principle of this bill which will in any way in the slightest degree violate the rights and interests of the workingmen of the United States; but I do claim—and I restate it—that the man who has been posing under the official seal of a United States officer has misrepresented the matter and has spoken without authority to the prejudice of the members of the Committee on Immigration.

In view of all these facts, as a final analysis, there is but one question upon which we vote—the best way to accomplish the object for which we are striving; to make this bill as effective as the English language can do; to make it just as effective under regulations of the Treasury Department as it would be under statutory law. After all, the success of the execution of this law will depend upon the vigilance of the officers in charge of its enforcement. The men who are stretched along our borders from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast are men who will be responsible, and can they not act as faithfully and as energetically under the regulation of the Treasury Department as they could if that regulation were a statute? I think they would do so.

Therefore I believe, Mr. President, that in the interest of this measure, under the conditions which are presented to-day, it is our duty, as it should be our privilege, to vote for the best law which will carry into effect the provisions we enact without violating the dignity and integrity of our Republic.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President, the debate upon the pending bill has proceeded for several days. There are many features of it to which I should like to advert if time permitted, but it is obvious that in the short space remaining before the vote begins I can only touch upon a few of its most important features.

There is one thing that has impressed me since the bill was reported to the Senate, and that has been the very strong feeling against it, due, it has seemed to me, to a misconception of its scope and purpose.

What is the precise question before the Senate? The question is whether the bill reported by the Committee on Immigration or the substitute proposed by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] shall be adopted. The bill as reported from the committee contained features which did not have the unanimous support of the members of the committee; but in its large purpose if had, I believe, the full approval of every member of the committee, Republican and Democratic alike.

The bill comes to the Senate from a committee the majority members of which are Republican, but it is not a party measure, and must stand solely upon its own merits. Is it against the interest of the American people or against any treaty of the Government? Wherein does it violate any treaty between the United States and the Chinese Empire? If there be in this bill one solitary word which is violative of any treaty I will gladly vote to eliminate it, for we should keep our international faith unswerving and unimpaired.

The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] yesterday urged the observance of faith with foreign nations, and he did not urge it too strongly. Sir, I have, and the members of the

Committee on Immigration have, as sensitive a regard for the national honor as has my distinguished friend or anyone else in the Senate of the United States. This bill violative of treaty rights? I challenge anyone in opposition to the measure to point out one line in it, as amended in the Senate by the committee and as it stands now, that is an infraction of our treaty obligations.

The bill as it was presented to the committee was drafted by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL], as able a statesman as ever sat in the Senate and regardless of the national honor. Associated with him were other distinguished Senators, Senators FOSTER of Washington and HEITFELD; and in the other House, Representatives METCALF, NEWLANDS, and KAHN.

The committee heard, in support of the bill and in opposition to it, everyone who was interested in the subject of Chinese exclusion. Who were they? The representatives of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, the Order of Railway Conductors, the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, the Knights of Labor, the Sailors' Union, representatives of manufacturing companies from New England and from the South, and the commission from the State of California—able, conservative men, knowing the needs of the service as well as anyone in the United States.

We heard also, Mr. President, the representatives of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company. They had a perfect right to be heard. Their interests were deeply concerned. The representatives of the Treasury Department also were heard. Furthermore, the eminent and able counsel of the Chinese Empire was heard at length in opposition to the bill. We gave to his arguments most careful attention, and wherein they were well founded in the opinion of the committee the bill was modified.

When the bill was reported to the Senate it contained some provisions which, as I said before, did not have the entire assent of the committee. I may be permitted to say they did not all have my approval.

The clause which excluded Chinese seamen from American ships did not have my approval nor the approval of all the members of the committee, and since the bill came to the Senate a motion was made to strike out that clause, by the honorable junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], with the concurrence, I may say, of the majority members of the committee.

Why? Because it was supposed that it would not accomplish the desired end of putting American seamen upon ships bearing the flag of the United States engaged in trans-Pacific service. The motion prevailed, and the objectionable clause was eliminated. Mr. LIVERNASH, an intelligent and worthy citizen, chairman of the Pacific coast commission, appeared before the committee, and, being interrogated upon this subject, said:

Speaking tentatively, for again I must remind the Senators that my information on this subject is comparatively vague, I will say that it seems to me probable something would have to be done for shipowners, by subsidization or otherwise, if the Congress should determine to drive Asiatics from American ships. The argument made before this committee—

Senator FAIRBANKS. They are operating in opposition with the British line immediately north of them, which employs Chinese cheap labor.

Mr. LIVERNASH. The Pacific Mail Steamship Company, whose vessels ply between Hongkong and San Francisco, competes with at least one English company running vessels between Hongkong and San Francisco and carrying Asiatic seamen. The Canadian Pacific steamships do not, I am informed, carry so many Chinese, proportionately, as do the trans-Pacific steamships plying to Pacific ports of the United States.

The general manager of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company, an able and intelligent officer, submitted a statement which was presented to the Senate yesterday, as follows:

It is therefore apparent from the above that if the vessels of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company, which form but a minimum percentage of the total tonnage employed in trans-Pacific trade, are compelled to substitute foreign seamen other than Chinese or seamen who have "intention papers" for the present crews, it will affect to a very small degree the employment of the so-called American sailor on the Pacific coast. Further, the business between China and the United States is only obtained by the keenest competition in regard to rates; and if the Pacific Mail Steamship Company is especially singled out from among all its competitors and compelled to pay a different rate of wage, it will be unable to continue to work under the American flag if it expects to remain in this traffic against the competition of ships under a foreign flag.

For example, it has been heretofore stated that the crew of the *China* numbered 162 souls; the monthly pay roll of the Americans and Europeans amounts to \$2,220 and of the Chinese to \$1,012.02, or a total of \$3,232.02. If a white crew is substituted for the Chinese, that portion of the pay roll will be increased from \$1,012.02 to \$4,520, United States gold coin, or the total monthly pay roll will be \$6,740, thereby increasing the yearly pay roll by \$42,095.96. In addition to the increase of the pay roll, there will be a very material increase in the cost of feeding the white crew as against the Chinese crew, which will amount to about \$500 per month for each steamer, or \$18,000 per year for the three steamers, while the total increase for the present three steamers would amount to about \$144,000 per annum.

Two steamships are being built for the Pacific Mail Steamship Company at the shipyards at Newport News, Va., for use in the trans-Pacific trade. One has just made her trial trip; the other is nearing completion. They are the finest and largest ships ever built in the United States. If the Chinese-crew clause should remain in the Chinese-exclusion bill, to take these new ships to the Pacific coast would be of doubtful expediency. The cost of operation would be increased by this bill \$75,000 a year for each ship above what it would be under the present conditions. The ships would therefore necessarily be placed under a foreign flag.



It is perfectly manifest that if we exclude Chinese sailors from our ships, we must absolutely drive every ship from the Pacific which bears our flag. We have but few ships on that great ocean. We should not drive them to seek foreign register. We should not adopt a policy which will pull down our flag and raise in its place the flag of some foreign nation. We shall have accomplished nothing in the interest of American seamen by the effort to exclude Chinese seamen from our ships under existing conditions. We shall do nothing but take a step backward in our attempt to build up a merchant marine. I shall be glad to see American seamen upon all our ships, but that we can place them there in the manner proposed is in the highest degree improbable.

Mr. President, there was in the bill as it was reported to the Senate another objectionable paragraph—the one which excluded Chinese from participating in expositions. It would have prevented their taking part in the exposition which is soon to be opened at St. Louis, in the great Mississippi Valley. China has accepted the invitation extended by the United States, but the bill as reported would have excluded her subjects from participating.

I am glad to say that provision was struck out upon the motion of the committee, upon the floor of the Senate, and an amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] was incorporated in the bill, under which China will be permitted to freely enjoy the hospitality of the United States under the invitation which was cordially extended.

What of the so-called Platt amendment? Under it the subjects of the Chinese Empire are absolutely forbidden to participate in the great exposition. I invite to this feature of the amendment the attention of those Senators from the Mississippi Valley, who are so interested in the success of this great international enterprise.

There were two other important features of the bill as it was reported to the Senate by the committee which did not meet my entire approval. They were sections 6 and 7, defining "students" and "teachers" among the excepted classes in the Gresham treaty. I am glad to say that, upon a motion made by me yesterday, those two sections were eliminated from the bill. I had a fear, Mr. President, shared in by some but not by all of my colleagues upon the committee, that those sections were violative of the treaty of 1894. Those who held to that view did not wish to write in this great law a solitary line that would be violative of a solemn international compact.

The term "merchant," which has been much criticised in the progress of this debate, is defined in the bill. It is but a literal reproduction of the definition found in existing law. In the opening of the debate there were those who believed that the provision of the bill with respect to merchants was unduly restrictive and that if it should become a law, it might interfere with our commerce with the Chinese Empire.

Mr. President, I pause here to say that the claim made by those in opposition, that it will impair or prejudice American commerce with China, seems to me to be without good foundation. It has not had that effect hitherto. Why should it operate prejudicially in the future?

It became necessary in the law of 1893 and other laws to define strictly the meaning of the word "merchant" as used in the treaty. That definition, as I have observed, is carried into the pending bill. Why? In order to prevent the admission of Chinese laborers contrary to the spirit and letter of the Gresham treaty in the interest, Mr. President, of the citizens of the United States.

Many frauds have been practiced upon the Government under the merchant clause of the treaty. Chinese merchants are easily and freely manufactured in the United States, and hundreds of Chinese laborers, known to be such in the Chinese Empire, have been admitted through the ports of the United States as belonging to the excepted class—merchants. One firm in Chicago was composed of over 50 members, claiming to be merchants, but who, excepting two or three, were nothing but laborers.

The Chinese know what our laws are and how to evade them. I sometimes think, Mr. President, they are more attentive students than some of our own citizens. How many of us have read the treaties, the laws, and the rules and regulations promulgated—

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Of course the Senator from New Hampshire has done so. He always does in full measure a statesman's duty.

Mr. GALLINGER. I rise, with the permission of the Senator, to say that one Senator had done so, and that he takes an entirely opposite view of this question from that being advocated by the Senator from Indiana. And now, Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PENROSE in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana desire to be interrupted?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I only have fifteen minutes remaining, Mr. President, and I have much ground to cover.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana declines to be interrupted.

Mr. GALLINGER. He has not yet declined, Mr. President.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I always gladly yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. I yielded very graciously to the Senator from Indiana the other day, and at length; but, of course, if the Senator does not wish to yield—

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I do yield with pleasure; no matter what time the Senator takes, he is welcome to it.

Mr. GALLINGER. I shall take but a moment.

The Senator from Indiana, Mr. President, is going to give us now some testimony of the frauds perpetrated by the Chinese. I want to ask the Senator if, in his opinion, the frauds perpetrated by the Chinese are any greater than those perpetrated by American citizens in the matter of the undervaluation of goods at the port of New York?

I want to call the attention of the Senator to just one other thing. The other day the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] very dramatically read from the New York Sun a story to the effect that six nuns had been smuggled into this country, or were attempted to be smuggled in, by a Chinaman in the garb of a Catholic priest. The Treasury Department knows nothing of that incident, and, in my opinion—and I have taken occasion to investigate it—there is no truth in it whatever.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I regret that I can not dwell upon that now. I wish that I had sufficient time to do so. But there are frauds, and I will ask permission to insert in the RECORD, without reading, the following evidence bearing upon the manner in which frauds are systematically committed under the merchant clause: The case is that of a Chinese laborer claiming to be a domiciled merchant returning to his store. As original evidence had been inadequate, he is here told how to deny and correct his previous statements.

For the information of Ah Choi: I have just sent a lawyer to the customhouse to inquire about your paper, as to why you could not land. It is because there is discrepancy in your testimony. It seems that you said you had been in the Man Wah Tai business for only seven months before you returned to China; that does not comply with the law; for that reason you are not allowed to land. You have to be in the business for more than a year before you can comply with the law. You said you went into business Kwang Shu 22d year, 10th month; that you went back to China Kwang Shu 23d year, 5th month, which makes but seven months; hard to land under those circumstances.

On the 26th day of the 6th month, a few days ago, I had already sent you testimony paper inside of shrimp pates. I don't know whether you have received it. I believe, though, that you did not receive it, because had you received it you would never have testified as you did.

I am now taking means to get your testimony fitted. Perhaps a new petition or affidavit has to be prepared, asking the collector of customs to command the interpreter to give you a second hearing, and perhaps you will be able to land. You may be sure I will do my best.

You say you went into the Man Wah Tai business Kwang Shu the 21st year and 10th month, making one year and seven months in business before your return to China.

In case you should be asked, "Why, then, did you formerly say that you went into business 10th month of the 22d year Kwang Shu, making only seven months that you were in business before your return to China," you answer, "I didn't say anything of the kind; I said I went into business in the 10th month and 21st year of Kwang Shu, making altogether one year and seven months in business. Very likely you did not hear right."

According to these means very likely you will be allowed to go.

The total capital in the Man Wah Tai business is \$7,000, divided into 14 shares, as follows: Lee Kung Yeo, \$500; Lee Choi, \$500; Lee Sher Dick, \$500; Lee Sher On, \$500; Lee Sher Wing, \$500; Jui Yock, \$500; Lee Kung Yau, \$500; Lee Steung Tsung, \$500; Lee Lok, \$500; Lee Look Tseam, \$500; Lee Yuen Sim, \$500; Lee Tsok, \$500; Lee Lum, \$500; Lee Po, \$500.

The manager, Lee Kung Yeo, attends to money matters; Lee Choi, salesman; Lee Sher On, bookkeeper; Lee Lok sold goods; the others were outside partners. Lee Kung Yeo sleeps in the store; the other partners live elsewhere.

I have known Lee Kung Yeo five or six years; I do not know whether Kung Yeo has not been back after his visit to China.

You say you went into the Man Wah Lee place at Borden; you have a share in that business of \$500; Lee Sai's share is \$3,000; Lee Sik Sam has a share of \$3,000; Lee Tsung has \$2,000; Lee Seung's share is \$1,000; Lee Kung Hin has \$1,000; Lau Tso, \$1,000; Man Wah Lee's business consists of seven shares; total capital, \$11,500. I lived in the town of Borden eight or nine months, until the tenth month of the twenty-first year, when I came out and went into the Man Wah Tai business because I was consumptive and I did not attend to much in the store. I went to San Francisco to engage the services of a doctor; that's how I became manager of Man Wah Tai's.

The fare from Borden to San Francisco is \$6.35. You first get to Madeira; farther in is Fresno, 20 miles away.

Your saying you were a laborer before the 20th year of Kwang Shu (1894) is all right.

If you should receive this testimony paper, send word by anybody that may be going ashore; will then act accordingly. Or if you send written word and let some one bring it up, that will be all right.

Be sure that you be very careful of written letters. Don't let them be captured.

I will not stop to point out other flagrant frauds upon the Government—there are many of them—and show the necessity of carefully guarded laws.

Now, Mr. President, it seems to me the way in which the committee has gone about perfecting this legislation is the only rational and satisfactory way. The bill has 55 sections. The present treaties, laws, decisions of the Attorneys-General, decisions of the solicitors of the Treasury Department, rules and regulations promulgated by the Treasury Department are found in a



pamphlet which has been laid upon the desk of every Senator, covering 57 closely printed pages.

Let anyone obliged to execute the Chinese-exclusion laws endeavor to learn the measure of his duty and the rights and duties of the United States and the rights and duties of those seeking admission from China, and he has to wade through numerous acts of Congress, numerous regulations, numerous decisions of the various law officers of the Government, covering many years. They are widely scattered. It is a serious task to find them. Is that right?

Mr. President, there is no one obliged to execute the laws of the United States who can go through the labyrinth of laws, regulations, and decisions relating to Chinese exclusion without often becoming confused. Was it not the duty of the Treasury Department to ask, as it has done, to have them codified into one comprehensive, compact, scientific bill?

The Platt amendment simply adds one more law to the mass upon the statute books, while the bill proposed by the committee embraces all laws, rules, and regulations now in force upon this question, and that is all it does. Is that prejudicial to China's interests? The committee, sir, has done well to present to the Senate a comprehensive measure for the guidance of the executive officers of the Government.

Mr. President, some reference has been made to the fact that the Chinese in this country have decreased during the last decennial period as compared with the preceding ten years. What does that signify? That no other laws are necessary? Does it suggest that the laws upon the statute books have not been evaded or violated? No, it shows nothing of the sort. It seems to me to be of no possible significance.

If at all times there had been adequate laws which the officers of the Government were obliged by the mandate of the Congress of the United States to execute, the number of Chinese laborers might have been still less, and probably would have been. Would that have been in derogation of the national interest? No, Mr. President. As an American citizen, I shall be glad to see the number diminish and their places taken by American citizens.

I shall be glad to see the Chinese labor population diminish and their places taken by Germans, by Dutch, by English, by Scandinavians, by other nationalities from whose blood we have sprung and have become the most puissant people upon the face of the globe. As Chinese laborers go out American laborers will go in. Is that hurtful to our national interest, Mr. President? Is it not in the fullest measure in the highest and best interest of our civilization?

Reference has been made to the very able letter of the Chinese minister, and much has been made of it. Minister Wu is an able and accomplished diplomat and, I may say, one who possesses the admiration and good wishes of the American people. What is his complaint, in a word? Is it that our laws with respect to the excepted classes are too restrictive? No; his chief complaint is that we exclude Chinese laborers.

What the minister most earnestly protests against is our labor-exclusion laws; and, in his judgment, we can secure a larger measure of commerce by the admission of Chinese labor into the United States. I read from his letter of the 10th of December last:

The review of the diplomatic history which I have made makes it clear, I think, that the Chinese negotiators of the treaty of 1880 did not contemplate a permanent exclusion of Chinese laborers from the United States, and the American commissioners held out the hope that it would be only a temporary measure and not general in its application.

That, Mr. President, is the gravamen, the exclusion of Chinese laborers.

And further—

Certain it is that if it had been proposed or intimated that the exclusion would continue for twenty years the Chinese Government never would have agreed to the treaty. It is also quite certain that if the present laws shall be reenacted the two Governments can not have the cordial and harmonious intercourse which should be maintained; neither can the commercial relations be as extensive, as intimate, and as profitable as the economic conditions of the two countries demand and justify.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator read from the letter of March 22?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. No, sir; I read from the letter of December 10. It is in Document No. 162.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is not the last letter.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. It continues:

Can the Government of the United States afford to pay the high price which it will cost to maintain laws which I think I have shown are contrary to the spirit and intent of the treaties, to the recognized principles of jurisprudence, and to the spirit of amity and fair dealing which should control the conduct of nations? I feel confident that if the honorable Congress of the United States will cause a thorough investigation of this subject to be made, uncontrolled by the unthinking clamor or selfish interests, it will find a better way to conserve the interests of this great country than by the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion laws as they now exist and are enforced.

It is obvious from what the distinguished Chinese minister says that any bill which affects Chinese exclusion he regards as imperiling the good relations existing between the two powers.

Mr. President, the great complaint is that we exclude Chinese laborers from our hospitality. He is apparently not so much concerned as to the excepted classes.

The United States is not unfriendly to the Chinese Empire. The proposed law is not dictated by any hostility to that venerable Government. We have but to go back a few months to find the most manifest evidence of our cordiality, of our friendly interest, and sympathy.

When the great nations of the earth sat about the international council chamber and many of them looked with covetous eyes upon the harbors, upon the cities, and provinces of China, the United States with her potential voice said "the integrity of the Chinese Empire shall not be destroyed;" and when other governments undertook to exact indemnities which would have bankrupted the Empire, the United States spoke for moderation, for justice, and for equity, and saved to China many millions of dollars.

Those who have suggested that the pending measure will jeopardize our commerce, misconceive its effect. It does not change existing laws and the regulations promulgated to give them effect. It is a change in form, but not a change in substance. By the enactment of the bill into law our trans-Pacific commerce will not decay, diminish, or fade away. We all desire to see our commerce expand; but we can not consent to purchase its extension by the abandonment of those restrictive measures which experience has justified, and which have tended to uphold the exalted standard of our American civilization.

By adhering to the course we have hitherto pursued we shall enjoy our full share of the trade in and beyond the Pacific. "Who shall say," said Garfield, "that the Pacific will not yet become the great historic sea of the future—the vast amphitheater around which shall sit in majesty and power the two Americas, Asia, Africa, and the chief colonies of Europe? In that august assemblage of nations the United States will be easily chief if she fill worthily the measure of her high destiny."

Mr. President I have but a moment more at my command. Let me again ask, in conclusion, what provision in the pending bill is in derogation of our treaty obligations to the Chinese Empire? If it is not in contravention of any treaty, if it is but a codification and simplification of existing laws, it should, it seems to me, receive the favorable consideration of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is in the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. LODGE. I think my amendment to strike out lines 11 to 18 on page 40 is the pending amendment. I moved it last night, to perfect the committee bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts offers an amendment which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 40 strike out lines 11 to 18, both inclusive, as follows:

And it shall be unlawful for any vessel not foreign—that is to say, any vessel under the flag of the United States—to have or to employ in its crew any Chinese person not entitled to admission to the United States, or into the particular territory of the United States to which such vessel plies; and any violation of this provision shall be punishable by a fine not exceeding \$2,000.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, the adoption of the amendment will relieve the bill of a very objectionable feature. All commerce is conducted on the high seas by sailors where they can be had. I suppose it would be impossible for an American ship to cross the Pacific Ocean and return if it could employ only American citizens. I doubt even if it could conduct the coast-wise trade if American citizens were to be employed altogether. Sailors are all over the world, and they are employed by shipmasters where they can get them.

Now, to say that this is in the interest of labor, it seems to me, is a burlesque. If we make it impossible to carry the American flag on our ships, we will injure shipbuilding here, and we will put out of employment in that business a thousand men where you give one American citizen the privilege of a coal heaver in the Tropics.

It is very difficult now to obtain enough skilled labor to man the ships. One-third of the crew on all the ships on the Pacific and in the Tropics must necessarily be high-grade labor, and it must be white labor, though not necessarily American. Many of them are foreigners, but it is very difficult even to get them. The privilege of taking the place of Chinese in heaving coal and cooking—doing the ordinary work on the ships in the Tropics—is not a privilege which American citizens covet. They prefer that we should have commerce, which will give them employment at home in building ships, creating products to be transported.

It is an absurdity to assume that anything which benefits commerce, which benefits industry, which makes wealth, is prejudicial to labor. All wealth is produced by labor, and if you destroy the means of producing wealth you impoverish labor. We must have markets for what we produce and we must carry our products to those markets. The laboring people of this country are

not such imbeciles as to think that this particular provision would be in their interest. There appears to be a desire to pander to some false sentiment. I am under no necessity to do it on this subject. But for me, as the RECORD will show, the Chinaman could have been a citizen. I did what I regretted very much to do at the time. I was on the Judiciary Committee. An amendment came in to strike out the word "white" after we had agreed to vote, not more than ten minutes before the vote was to be taken.

I said I would not be bound by the agreement. Every member of the committee begged me not to violate the agreement. All my friends about the Senate appealed to me. I told them I must violate it if they brought in that proposition. Finally the Senator from Vermont, Mr. Edmunds, on the committee, appealed to me to let the vote be taken. I let the vote be taken, and it was voted in by a vote of 27 to 22. The struggle went on over the 4th of July. No adjournment was taken, and about 1 or 2 o'clock on the 5th of July the vote was taken in the Senate. The first vote was taken as in Committee of the Whole. When the vote was taken in the Senate the amendment was beaten by a vote of 30 to 14. There was no question about it. It got in first without debate. When the time came to explain it, it was beaten. I took that risk, and I took it knowing that the Senate would absolve me if the Senate knew what the proposition was.

I can not be led away by a desire to pander to some sailors. When we have protected labor on land, when we have protected labor everywhere, as we do protect it, we have to employ foreigners in our shipping. If you pass a law to the contrary we destroy it. It is a new idea, a foolish idea, prejudicial to labor, and I am delighted that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has offered an amendment to strike it from the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. QUAY. Mr. President, I accept the suggestion of the Chair made an hour or two ago, and will speak to this amendment. I desire to say in beginning that I will speak briefly, and further, that I can not join in the general howl and attack upon the Chinese as Chinese. I have a deep respect for the Chinese nation—for its antiquity, intelligence, patriotism, and exclusiveness. Its history reaches farther back into the past than that of any other nation. Its great families have genealogies of thousands of years, well authenticated, and surpassed in duration only by a very few among the Hebrews. It invented gunpowder, the mariner's compass, the manufacture of porcelain and silk, and China was the mother of philosophy and higher mathematics. Its ruler, the present Empress Dowager, who during fifty years, since she was 18 years of age, has dominated its policy and governed 400,000,000 people, is the greatest woman born in Asia for many centuries.

I regret that China has become obnoxious in the circles of American politics on account of her barbarism and the low condition of her laboring classes.

The organization known as the Boxers is the offspring of patriotism. Its underlying idea is the theory of this bill. "Exclude the foreign devils; China for the Chinese," cries the Chinese Boxer.

"Exclude the Chinese; America for the Americans," says my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Immigration, and to a large extent I sympathize with him. If he will strike out the word "Chinese" in the first paragraph of this bill and add to it the words "during the term of five years," making it exclude all importation of labor, I could adopt its eccentricities and vote for it, panicky and tumultuous as it is. I can not approve of the segregation of China from the world as the object of a commercial hostility. I can not conceive of the propriety of excluding Chinese labor and opening our ports to all the ring-streaked, speckled, and spotted importation of Asia and Africa, nor why a Tartar living on the left bank of the Amur River should come free into this country and the Tartar on the right bank should not.

We have labor enough in this country now for general purposes. It is our surplus labor which in hard times brings down wages and produces distress and disorder. We are short in agricultural labor. But for improved machinery we could not harvest our crops. The want of domestic servants has also become a great and vexatious problem. These classes compete with no American labor and might well be excepted in this bill. But our laboring people in Pennsylvania have become imbued with the idea that they are threatened with a flood of competing Chinese labor and with no other competition, and I feel like deferring to some extent to their wishes in this legislation. They favor the House bill. I can not go with them to that extent, and I do not recognize the House bill in the mutilated measure now about to be voted upon.

I will proceed to speak as to my amendment proper when it becomes in order.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, I understand that

during my temporary absence from the Chamber the amendment which I have proposed was criticised on the ground that it did not include a provision allowing Chinese persons to come to this country in connection with the St. Louis Purchase Exposition. I do not think it is at all necessary that it should. As the bill was reported from the Committee on Immigration it contained a clause to the effect that Chinese persons should not be permitted to come to this country for the purpose of taking part in expositions. There was no such provision in the law before. There is no such provision in the proposed law now, it having been amended upon the motion of the Senator from Missouri, to allow Chinese persons to come and participate in the St. Louis Exposition. They have always been allowed to come and participate in expositions. They were here at the Buffalo Exposition, the most recent. There is nothing in the present law which forbids it, and Treasury regulations and the administration of the law under Treasury regulations have permitted it.

Mr. President, when the St. Louis Exposition bill passed there was provided for an invitation to foreign countries. In section 9 it was provided:

SEC. 9. That whenever the President of the United States shall be notified by the national Commission that provision has been made for grounds and buildings for the uses herein provided for, he shall be authorized to make proclamation of the same, through the Department of State, setting forth the time at which said exposition will be held, and the purpose thereof; and he shall communicate to the diplomatic representatives of foreign nations copies thereof, together with such regulations as may be adopted by the Commission, for publication in their respective countries; and he shall, in behalf of the Government and the people, invite foreign nations to take part in the said exposition and to appoint representatives thereto.

I do not know whether or not that invitation has gone forward to China. I do know, I think, that a representative of the fair has been appointed to go to Asiatic countries and endeavor to secure their participation in the exposition.

Now, Mr. President, it being the fact that under the law as it exists, and which my amendment would continue, Chinese subjects have been permitted to come for the purpose of participating in fairs, and it being the fact that the bill providing for the St. Louis Purchase Exposition directs the President to invite foreign nations without exception to come and participate, I think there can be no objection to my amendment on that ground.

Mr. MALLORY. Mr. President, the amendment which is now before the Senate, presented by the junior Senator from Massachusetts, proposes to strike out of the bill the provision prohibiting the employment of Chinamen on vessels holding American registry. That is, in my humble judgment, one of the most important and beneficent provisions of the pending measure.

The purpose of this measure, as I understand it—that is, the purpose which seems to have great weight with members of this body—is to prevent the influx of any very large number of Asiatics into this country, because of the apprehension that they may materially interfere with the employment of our American workingman. In fact, those members of this body who are opposed to the committee bill are largely in favor of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut, which continues in force the existing law, whereby Chinese immigration is greatly limited and restricted. It is a fact that that is one of the main objects and purposes of this measure and one in which almost all Senators agree, namely, the purpose of excluding Chinamen from competing with our domestic labor. If that be the fact, then it appears to me that this is a most striking illustration of that species of legislation.

Our merchant marine, as has been said here time and time again, is in a languishing condition, and we have thought proper, at least the majority of this body have thought proper, in order to rehabilitate it to put upon our statute books, as far as this body can do it, a law appropriating \$9,000,000 per annum, if necessary, for the purpose of encouraging the building of ships and enabling shipowners to carry on their business. It is well known that we have not enough native American seamen to man the Navy which we are building. We certainly will not add to the number of seamen of this country by opening the door for hordes of Chinamen who, as has been stated here on several occasions in different debates in this body, work for at most about one-half what the American or Caucasian sailor is willing to work for, and unless we do something that will exclude this extremely cheap competition with the American sailor we will drive him from the high seas, we will drive him from the decks of our own vessels, and therefore deprive ourselves of a resource for manning our naval fleet with American seamen. The Chinaman can not be naturalized under existing law, he can not become a citizen of the United States, and in time of war when we want to draw upon our merchant marine for sailors, stokers, firemen, and oilers to man the battle ships and swift cruisers that we are building, we will find that we have none but Chinamen on the Pacific, at least unless we do something to prevent the influx of these Chinese competitors with the American sailor.

The argument which is presented here, some telegrams received



from shipowners, that this would paralyze the shipping industry on the Pacific, is one which I do not think is at all conclusive, although it may be plausible, because it is a fact, as far as I have been able to gather, that there is now only one important line of ships sailing from the Pacific coast to the Orient which employs Chinese sailors. If we put our stamp of reprobation upon the employment of Chinamen on board of our ships I take it that there will be no effort hereafter to put them into the service of our merchant marine and that we will hereafter have no difficulty, so far as the Pacific is concerned, in securing Caucasian sailors whenever they are needed.

As it is now, if this amendment is adopted and this provision stricken from the bill, it will be notice to the world that the United States is ready to invite all the Asiatic cheap labor that chooses to come from the Asiatic shores on American ships to this country. It will drive out a great many American sailors who now have employment upon the various lines plying from the Pacific coast to Australia and to the Orient generally, and it will certainly have a most injurious effect upon the morale of the American sailor. We need, besides men before the mast, stokers and firemen, intelligent men, to run the engines in case of necessity, coal passers, and deck hands generally. Those men are absolutely essential, and by being employed in the commercial marine they are enabled to learn the ways of the sea and could be rendered very useful in the service of the Navy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, I am heartily in favor of this amendment on the ground of common justice to American shipping and American interests. The amendment should be adopted. I can not understand what was in the mind of the committee reporting the bill, why it saw fit to discriminate so sharply against American shipping in favor of foreign shipping by prohibiting American vessels from employing Chinese crews and allowing foreign vessels to do so. The difference under this provision against the American line on the Pacific amounts to about \$40,000 per annum.

It is well known that on the Pacific there are 8 foreign and 1 American steamship companies doing business between the Orient and Pacific coast ports. The 8 foreign companies employ 56 vessels and the American steamship company 3. This committee is willing that the 8 foreign steamship companies shall employ Chinese labor and land at all of our ports on the Pacific coast or wherever they choose without let or hindrance, but when it comes to American ships Chinese labor must be excluded. The bill expressly provides that the foreign ships with Chinese crews shall land under certain conditions and restrictions, but refuses to allow these restrictions to extend to American vessels. If foreign vessels can land with Chinese crews under proper safeguards, why could not American vessels do the same?

Now, what was the purpose? Why was this done? Why was this discrimination made against American vessels? What has the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER], so violently interested in this bill, against American interests and American ships, and why does he strongly prefer foreign ships? How can he justify his vote here in bringing in a bill of this kind?

I stand here for American interests against all other interests, and I want American shipping under our laws to be on an equal footing on the Pacific Ocean and elsewhere with foreign ships. Prohibiting American vessels from employing Chinese makes a difference in cost of operating of about \$42,000 per annum. This is a large item in running expenses, and is, in effect, a donation to foreign vessels in competition with American vessels. If American vessels are not to be allowed to have Chinese crews, then I am opposed to any foreign vessels landing at any ports of the United States with Chinese crews. This is only fair dealing. I am not ready to drive American ships off the Pacific by discriminating in favor of foreign vessels.

Let us make conditions equal so far as we can. Why not exclude all vessels from landing that employ Chinese crews and Chinese labor the same as you have provided in the bill against American ships?

Mr. President, all of us are against Chinese immigration. We are united in excluding Chinese labor from our country. It is a definite, determined American policy; one that can not be reversed; the people will not allow it. The present act simply carries out this definite policy.

I hold that unless we should exclude the Chinese they would in the end exclude us, and therefore it is in our interest to do so; and because I can not vote for this bill that is so drastic, so offensive to a friendly government, so recklessly drawn that it sounds like a stump speech instead of a solemn act of Congress, I do not want it taken that I am in favor of the Chinese or Chinese immigration. Furthermore, Mr. President, because I can not agree that the Republican party worships at the shrine of wealth, and here protest against such a charge, I am not to be set down as a friend of Chinese immigration.

Now, Mr. President, this bill is clearly against treaty obligations. They are sacred and should be kept. This Government must keep its faith until the treaty is denounced, no matter what China has done. It does not justify us because of a Boxer rebellion that occurred a year or two ago, and the Chinese Government could not control, that we are entitled to violate at random and recklessly solemn treaty obligations. Because China may have done wrong does not authorize this great Republic to become a highwayman among nations and do wrong also. I am astounded that any Senator should advocate such a course. It is the weight of opinion of the best lawyers in the Senate and in the country that this bill, if it becomes a law, will violate the treaty, and I claim as long as the treaty is in force its provisions must be observed.

Then, again, Mr. President, under the present law the number of Chinese in the United States is being reduced at the rate of 40 per cent in ten years. There are only about 56,000 Chinese in the United States, according to our last census. At this rate of reduction under the present law it will not take long to get rid of all the Chinamen in the country. This is gratifying progress, and we are doing it in a way that does not offend the Chinese Government. We have won great prestige in the Orient, and especially in China, by our policy and conduct last year, and we want to maintain this prestige. We want to maintain friendly relations in the interest of extending and establishing our trade with 400,000,000 consumers. We do not want to recklessly throw this advantage away.

Mr. President, there is danger of this bill, if it became a law, offending China and this would be very serious. Any other self-respecting nation on earth would be offended. If China should withdraw her minister from this capital, sever diplomatic relations, be as harsh to us as this bill is to them, expel our merchants, close her ports to American ships, this would simply prove disastrous to the United States and especially the South. The first hour after Congress assembled again it would repeal such an act in order to win back the friendship and trade of China; but it might be too late. Already our exports are about \$30,000,000 a year.

Now, do we want, or does the South want, to turn its back on this trade—throw away this opportunity and get nothing in return? I am from the South. I love the South, desire its success and its progress. I love its people and I seek its good. Although I am a Republican, I feel I have a right to speak in part for the South. What the South needs now is to put aside prejudice and build up her business—take advantage of her great resources.

Cotton goods are the largest factor in our exports to China, and they are largely from the South. England and Russia are ready to take advantage of any mistake we may make. Suppose they secure this advantage pending a disagreement or difference between China and the United States, how are we to win it back? We might never be able to do so. President McKinley and our very able Secretary made a great effort to secure the open door for the United States in China. Now, are we ready by law and by our own act to close this door, which may never be opened to us again?

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, an American ship is American territory, and the American flag flying over an American ship, it seems to me, should afford the same protection to the men who are engaged in sailing that ship as the flag gives to laborers on the land.

As I suggested a little while ago, every class of labor in the United States, except the sailor labor, is protected by three separate and distinct acts of Congress—by the tariff law as claimed by every friend of protection, by the law that excludes contract labor coming from foreign countries, and by the Chinese-exclusion laws. I can not comprehend why the sailors of the United States should be cast adrift upon a barren and bleak shore, there to perish, while every other class of labor of the United States, it is claimed, receives perfect and ample protection.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] yesterday morning read somewhere in the neighborhood of a hundred telegrams, chiefly from San Francisco, for the purpose of demonstrating that the provisions of this measure, including the clause that excludes the Chinese from American ships, are obnoxious to the Pacific coast. I need only refer to the attitude of the two Senators from the State of California upon this measure with reference to this clause to show that his telegrams are misleading, for I imagine that the Senators from California comprehend what the sentiment of the State of California and the Pacific coast is and what is good for the interests of those States and what is good for American shipping better than the comparatively few gentlemen who were induced to send the telegrams the Senator from New Hampshire read yesterday.

Mr. President, I want to call attention again to what the Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS] said upon the subject of the

amendment that is now under discussion. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. FAIRBANKS] said:

Something has been said as to the inability to secure American seamen for the trans-Pacific service. I should like to have the Senator, if he can, give us some information upon that subject.

The Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS] replied:

The best answer I think I can make to the question is that there are a number of steamship companies running vessels out of San Francisco employing a large number of sailors, firemen, and coal passers which do not employ Chinese. I have myself for thirty years been connected with a steamship company employing from 1,500 to 3,000 men most of the time, and we never have employed, to my knowledge, a Chinaman during that period.

As to vessels running into the Tropics, all of the United States transports now engaged in the service, plying between San Francisco and the Orient, the Philippine Islands and Japan, have white coal passers, white stokers, and white firemen. Their whole crews are Caucasian.

The ships plying to Central America from San Francisco and to the coast of Central America and Mexico, and German ships running down the coast of Central America to South America, all employ white firemen and white coal passers and white deck hands (sailors). The ships of the Oceanic Steamship Company, one of which runs every two weeks to New Zealand and Australia, run to Honolulu, across the equator, and go down through the Tropics. They all employ white men. The steamers running from San Francisco to Samoa, to the Fiji Islands, also employ all white men. It is the same way with vessels of our Navy.

The Senator from California further testified that there were plenty of white sailors upon the Pacific coast to man every American ship now in existence, and that there would be enough to supply them as fast as they were brought into existence. So far as the other ships are concerned—ships belonging to foreign companies—if the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] will do what he said he would do, I stand ready to introduce an amendment to prohibit any ship entering an American port manned by Chinese crews. There is nothing in our laws, Mr. President, and everything in our policy that would sustain an amendment such as that.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I am very sorry indeed that the one hundred and twenty-odd telegrams that I had the honor to read did not convert the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON] to a support of the Platt amendment to this bill.

During my enforced absence this morning I believe something over a hundred more telegrams from the Pacific coast were presented to the Senate by the President pro tempore. I have six or eight additional ones which I want to put into the RECORD in the hope that before we come to a final vote on the bill even the Senator from Colorado and the two Senators from California may see their way clear to vote for the Platt amendment. These telegrams are as follows:

MENLO PARK, CAL., April 15, 1902.

WILLIAM P. FRYE, President United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Platt amendment, Chinese bill, ought to be adopted.

J. LEROY NICKEL.  
S. E. SLADE.

MENLO PARK, CAL., April 15, 1902.

WILLIAM P. FRYE, President United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Adoption of Platt amendment, Chinese bill, is important and just.

TIMOTHY HOPKINS.  
C. W. SMITH.

SAUSALITO, CAL., April 15, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, President United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully urge passage Platt amendment, April 11; believe it amply sufficient for all needs and more just to mercantile interests.

ROBERT P. GREER.

MENLO PARK, CAL., April 15, 1902.

WILLIAM P. FRYE, President United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

I hope Congress will admit Chinese merchants and students.

JOHN P. DOYLE.

SAUSALITO, CAL., April 15, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, President United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Passage of exclusion bill now pending in the Senate would be an act of injustice to the mercantile interests of the United States and particularly affecting the Pacific coast. Respectfully petition use every effort for the passage of the Platt amendment of April 11, reenacting present Geary law.

C. T. HAMILTON.

MENLO PARK, CAL., April 15, 1902.

WILLIAM P. FRYE, President United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We approve of Platt amendment Chinese bill.

PERRY EYRE.  
AUGUST TAYLOR.

MENLO PARK, CAL., April 15, 1902.

WILLIAM P. FRYE, President United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We favor adoption of Platt amendment, Chinese bill.

THEODORE PAYNE.  
HUGO D. KEIL.

Now, Mr. President, I have only one minute to say that I think these telegrams, probably over 200 in number, coming from men who are engaged in mercantile and transportation pursuits on the Pacific coast, are entitled to a great deal of consideration by the Senate of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. MALLORY. I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that the amendment may be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be again read.

Mr. BATE. I do not know whether it is a motion to lay on the table or not. Let us know the parliamentary situation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is directly, up to the present time, on the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to strike out certain words, which the Secretary will read.

The SECRETARY. Strike out on page 40, lines 11 to 18, inclusive, as follows:

And it shall be unlawful for any vessel not foreign—that is to say, any vessel under the flag of the United States—to have or to employ in its crew any Chinese person not entitled to admission to the United States, or into the particular territory of the United States to which such vessel plies; and any violation of this provision shall be punishable by a fine not exceeding \$2,000.

Mr. CULBERSON. The Secretary seems to be reading from an old copy of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. He is reading from the last printed edition.

Mr. BACON. I ask him to give the section, as we have different copies.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The page and section will be read.

The SECRETARY. Section 39, page 40, strike out lines 11 to 18, inclusive.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll on agreeing to the amendment.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KEAN (when Mr. DRYDEN's name was called). My colleague [Mr. DRYDEN] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS]. If he were present, on this question he would vote "yea."

Mr. HEITFELD (when Mr. DUBOIS's name was called). My colleague [Mr. DUBOIS] is absent by reason of sickness in his family. He had intended to speak in support of the bill and to vote for the bill and against all amendments that were material. He, as the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] has stated, is paired with the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. DRYDEN]. If my colleague were present he would vote "nay" on this amendment.

Mr. HANSBROUGH (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL]. If that Senator were present I should vote "yea."

Mr. FOSTER of Louisiana (when Mr. McENERY's name was called). My colleague [Mr. McENERY] is absent by reason of sickness. He has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. DEPEW]. I am authorized by my colleague to state that if he were present he would vote in favor of the bill and against the pending amendment.

Mr. McMILLAN (when his name was called). I ask if the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN] has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that he has not.

Mr. McMILLAN. I am paired with that Senator and withhold my vote.

Mr. CULLOM (when Mr. MASON's name was called). My colleague [Mr. MASON] is absent, but I understand he is in favor of this bill.

Mr. MITCHELL (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS]. He is absent, as has been stated, by reason of sickness in his family, and my pair has been transferred to the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. DRYDEN]. I vote "nay."

Mr. MONEY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], who has not voted. He is not here. I respect that pair. I do not know how he would vote. If he were here, I should vote "nay."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 47, nays 29; as follows:

#### YEAS—47.

Aldrich,	Dillingham,	Jones, Nev.	Platt, N. Y.
Allison,	Elkins,	Kean,	Pritchard,
Beveridge,	Fairbanks,	Kearns,	Proctor,
Blackburn,	Foraker,	Kittredge,	Quarles,
Burnham,	Foster, Wash.	Lodge,	Quay,
Burrows,	Frye,	McComas,	Scott,
Barton,	Gallinger,	McCumber,	Spooner,
Clapp,	Gamble,	McMillan,	Stewart,
Clark, Wyo.	Gibson,	Millard,	Warren,
Cockrell,	Hanna,	Morgan,	Wellington,
Cullom,	Hawley,	Pettus,	Wetmore.
Dietrich,	Hoar,	Platt, Conn.	



## NAYS—29.

Bacon,  
Bailey,  
Bard,  
Bate,  
Berry,  
Carmack,  
Clark, Mont.  
Clay,

Culberson,  
Foster, La.  
Harris,  
Heitfeld,  
Jones, Ark.  
McLaurin, Miss.  
McLaurin, S. C.  
Mallory,

Martin,  
Mitchell,  
Nelson,  
Patterson,  
Penrose,  
Perkins,  
Rawlins,  
Simmons,

Taliaferro,  
Teller,  
Tillman,  
Turner,  
Vest.

## NOT VOTING—12.

Daniel,  
Deboe,  
Depew,

Dolliver,  
Dryden,  
Dubois,

Hale,  
Hansbrough,  
McEnery,

Mason,  
Money,  
Simon.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair calls the attention of the Senate to the clause in section 39, beginning in line 19, on page 40, and going down to line 12, on the next page. Those lines are connected with the clause which has just been stricken out, and in the opinion of the Chair no action is necessary, because this provision was passed over when it was reached as a committee amendment.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, to which I call the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] who reported this bill. In section 2, on page 2, line 7, after the word "laborers," I move to insert "not citizens of the United States;" in line 9, of the same section, after the word "all," I move to insert "such;" and in line 13, in the same section, after the words "apply to," I move to insert the word "such."

Mr. PENROSE. I feel authorized to accept that amendment, because it is simply a declaration of what has been the law anyway.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 2, on page 2, line 7, after the word "laborers," it is proposed to insert "not citizens of the United States;" in line 9, after the word "all," to insert "such;" and in line 13, after the words "apply to," to insert "such;" so as to make the clause read:

SEC. 2. That from and after the passage of this act the entry into the American-mainland territory of the United States of Chinese laborers not citizens of the United States coming from any of the insular territory of the United States shall be absolutely prohibited; and this prohibition shall apply to all such Chinese laborers, as well to those who were in such insular territory when the same was acquired by the United States as to those who have come there since, and it shall also apply to those who have been born there since, and to those who may be born there hereafter. And the same prohibition of entry shall apply to such Chinese laborers coming to one island of the United States from any other insular territory of the United States, except territory of a group whereof such island is a member.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be regarded as agreed to.

Mr. SPOONER. No, Mr. President; I hope that amendment will not be adopted. I do not understand the object of it. Under our naturalization laws, as I understand, no Chinaman may become a citizen of the United States. If that amendment is adopted it would be an implication, so far as legislation could raise an implication, of the understanding of Congress that, because of the acquisition of territory by the United States in which reside Chinamen, they may thereby become or have become citizens of the United States.

Mr. CARMACK. If they have become citizens of the United States can they be excluded?

Mr. SPOONER. Whether they have become citizens is a question of law, which need not be aided by any legislative recognition from my standpoint. I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. HOAR. May there not be a Chinese laborer born in Milwaukee, under the definition of this bill?

Mr. SPOONER. There might be a Chinese laborer born in Milwaukee.

Mr. HOAR. Yes; and if he left the country he might be denied the right to return to the United States, within the definition of this bill.

Mr. SPOONER. Then I think the amendment ought to be amended so as to be confined not to Chinese born in Milwaukee, but to Chinese born in the United States.

Mr. McCOMAS. I should like to ask the Senator if this Chinaman, Wong Kim Ark, himself born in this country of parents who were citizens of the United States, should go out of this country and come again into it, how could he be admitted under this section of the bill, unless the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee were adopted?

Mr. SPOONER. I do not know that Wong Kim Ark, or whatever his name may be, was a citizen of the United States.

Mr. McCOMAS. He was, because he was born of parents who were subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

Mr. SPOONER. He was born in a State?

Mr. McCOMAS. Yes; and when he wanted to come back to this country, under this section of the bill how could he come into the country unless this amendment were adopted?

Mr. SPOONER. I am perfectly willing that the amendment should be adopted applying to Chinamen born in the United States, but as it is offered it might mean very much more than that.

Mr. HOAR. Does not the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee, as I understand it, include only citizens?

Mr. CARMACK. That is all.

Mr. HOAR. If that be true, citizenship will be determined by the courts under the Constitution and the laws, and this act of Congress can not change the Constitution one way or another. The word "citizens" seems to me to cover everything.

Mr. TELLER. Before the interdiction of Chinese naturalization some Chinamen were naturalized. I have known some Chinese who were legally naturalized, and of course we can not take away from them the right of naturalization. Quite a number of children have been born of Chinese parents in the United States, and, as the courts have held, they are citizens. So that there is enough of that class to afford a reasonable excuse for putting the proposed amendment in the bill.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I have before me the case of Wong Kim Ark, in which the Supreme Court of the United States distinctly decided that the fact that Wong Kim Ark was a citizen of the United States entitled him to entry into the United States, and that he could not be excluded from the United States. The issue in that case really was whether the Chinaman Wong Kim Ark was a citizen of the United States. That fact being ascertained, the court ruled, as a matter of undeniable and indisputable law, that he was entitled to entry into the United States. The court having determined that he was a citizen of the United States, his right of entry into the United States was recognized and conceded as beyond dispute. The court ruled that, although born of a Chinaman and a Chinawoman not citizens of the United States, he was still a citizen of the United States, because born in the United States, and, being a citizen of the United States, he was entitled to come into this country. The distinct issue was as to whether he had a right to enter the United States, and the court ruled that, being a citizen, he was entitled to enter.

Mr. President, I do not see in what way the apprehension of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] can have any legitimate foundation. The amendment is a simple declaration of that which is the right of a citizen, so declared by the Constitution of the United States; a right which, in the absence of words sought to be inserted, might be denied to such a person; and, as suggested by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. McCOMAS], the language as it is now found in the bill would deny to any Chinese laborer, even though he be a citizen of the United States, the right to enter. Upon that decision of the court, in 169 U. S., found on page 649, it seems to me the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee is entirely proper.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. If I may ask the Senator a question, does he think we can by any law bar out a citizen of the United States from coming into the United States?

Mr. BACON. I do not.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Then the amendment is unnecessary.

Mr. BACON. But, Mr. President, we ought not to say that which we have no right to say. This bill does say that no Chinese laborer shall enter the United States whether he be a citizen or not a citizen; and while I believe the courts would declare that it would be inoperative to the extent that it sought to exclude one who is a citizen, we, as legislators, certainly ought not to put upon the statute book that which is in violation of the Constitution of the United States simply upon the supposition that the courts will declare it to be inoperative.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator will permit me, I was not able for a moment to see how an American citizen could be a Chinese laborer.

Mr. BACON. Oh, yes.

Mr. SPOONER. He might be an American laborer of Chinese descent.

Mr. BACON. Yes. But the Senator certainly will appreciate the fact that the words "Chinese laborer" here are a generic term, which intend to include every Chinaman who is of the class of laborers. A man who is by birth or by race, although born in this country, of Chinese blood, is called a Chinaman. If he is of the cooly class, he is called a Chinese laborer; but, according to the terms of this bill as it now stands, even though he be a citizen of the United States—and it has been shown that that is entirely possible—he would be excluded so far as this law could exclude him. Of course, it is true that the law might be declared inoperative, and I think it would be, but that does not relieve us of the obligation to so frame this law as to make it in its letter, so far as we can, within the terms and requirements of the Constitution.

Mr. HOAR. The term "Chinese" is defined in section 52 of the bill, and it includes "all male and female persons who are

Chinese either by birth or descent, as well those of mixed blood as those of the full blood." So the term "Chinese," without any limitation or qualification, includes an American citizen, whether naturalized or born of Chinese parents. That being true, we should either make the exception which the Senator from Tennessee proposes or we have got to rely on the fact that it would be unconstitutional to pass the bill without the exception. I mean the bill without the exception would be unconstitutional. Now, if we rely on the latter fact, nobody supposes that the custom-house officials are going to take the responsibility of declaring an enactment of the United States unconstitutional. The party aggrieved, therefore, has got to carry his case to some court of sufficient dignity and authority to presume to declare that this law is pro tanto unconstitutional. It seems to me, therefore, that, if without the limitation it is constitutional as applied to a certain class of persons, we ought to put the limitation in it.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair begs pardon of the Senator for a moment. The Chair calls the attention of the Senate to the fact that under Rule VIII no Senator is entitled to speak more than once to the same question. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President, my object in offering this amendment is to make it clear that we are not attempting to do an unconstitutional thing. It is true, as the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] says, that we have no right to bar any person who is a citizen of the United States; but the language of the section as it stands now may be construed as an attempt to do that very thing. I simply want to make it clear that we are not attempting to do it, and that we are not attempting to violate the Constitution of the United States by the passage of this bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee will be adopted. I think it should have been in the bill in the first place, if for no other reason because of the fact that we have a good many native-born Chinamen in this country. We have in my own town quite a number, who vote at every election, of persons who were born in the United States of Chinese parents. As the bill now stands, it seems to me if any of those citizens of Chinese descent should go to China or go out of the United States they would not be permitted to return here.

So far as I am concerned, I have no fear of the great mass of Chinamen in the Philippine Islands having become citizens by virtue of the transfer of allegiance from Spain to the United States. That question does not trouble me at all, but, perhaps, it may trouble some Senators. For the reason I have stated, I think the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. QUAY. Mr. President, speaking to this amendment, I desire to have read Chapter XXXV from a work entitled "China in Convulsion," by Arthur H. Smith, a standard authority upon what transpired in Peking during the siege of the legations. The succeeding three chapters I desire to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, without reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary proceeded to read the matter referred to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. QUAY. Mr. President, I ask that the Secretary be allowed to read the concluding sentence of the chapter, being Miss Bishop's statement as to the character of the Chinese. It is the last clause in the chapter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania? There being no objection, the Secretary will read the request.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading, as follows:

#### XXXIII.—NOTABLE EXPERIENCES.

##### CANADIAN PRESBYTERIAN MISSION, NORTH HONAN.\*

The trouble which began in Honan during the spring seemed to be local in character, originating in the severe drought from which we had been suffering. Three crops in succession had failed. As early as March there were riots in different places. Some of these were of a serious nature, in which there were conflicts between the people and soldiers, lives being lost on both sides. By the month of June matters became very serious indeed, every day bringing fresh reports of granaries searched and wealthy farmers looted by bands of starving men. The magistrates stationed small posts of militia at all the market towns, but were unable to preserve peace. They acknowledged their helplessness by refusing to punish any who were accused of stealing grain, saying it was useless to punish starving men, and that those who had lost grain might look upon it as having afforded help to their distressed neighbors.

\* Prepared at the author's request by the Rev. James A. Slimmon, one of the party.

On June 15 we were startled to receive a telegram from Tientsin saying, "Escape south." We also got the news of the murder of two Belgians at Pao Ting Fu. Not having had any reliable news from Tientsin for several weeks, we were ignorant of what was happening there and did not feel like deserting our station without knowing the reason why we had been advised to do so. We waited on anxiously looking for letters but none came.

Meanwhile we communicated with Mr. Jameson and party of the Peking Syndicate, who had passed through our town on the way to Huai Ch'ing Fu. In reply, there came a letter from Mr. C. D. Jameson, saying that he saw no reason for escaping, as he had not had any word from his agents at Tientsin or Peking, and he could rely on their sending word if matters were very serious. But for our comfort, he added, that if we thought it necessary to go he would place everything he had at our disposal—arms, money, etc.—and the personal services of himself and Messrs. Reid and Fisher.

On June 19 we received word that our friends at Ch'u Wang were besieged by a mob of over a thousand people. This trouble was brought on by a woman who declared she had seen Mrs. MacKenzie at an upper window performing mysterious rites and sweeping the clouds from the sky. Mrs. MacKenzie had been cleaning a window in her new house, and this, seen from the outside, looked like making passes and motions toward the clouds. The mob gathered around for two or three days, but seemed to be in need of a leader. The official on being appealed to for help promised to send it, but first of all tried to disarm our friends by asking for a loan of any rifles or other arms in their possession. This ingenious request was politely refused, as was also one for a few thousand taels of silver "to purchase arms for the soldiers."

From this time on till the 24th things began to look more and more threatening. Our bankers refused to pay us any more money, although they had a considerable balance in our favor. We heard of Boxer societies springing up in different towns and gradually coming nearer us, until on the 24th a few Boxer teachers arrived and founded a Boxer school. The motto of this branch was "First kill the foreigners, then annihilate the Manchus."

On June 25 we received word that our friends at Chang Tê Fu and Ch'u Wang had decided to make their escape, and that they were arranging to travel together to Chi Nan Fu, which seemed the best route. Later on they had to abandon this plan, as they found it impossible to hire carts for the trip, could get no escort across the strip of Chihli Province which lies between Honan and Shantung, and had no means of speedy communication with the governor of Shantung. Our friends had decided on this step because of another telegram which had arrived, saying that the Taku forts had been taken by the Allied Forces. We knew then that trouble was certain. We sent off messengers, one to ask Mr. Jameson and party to meet us at the Yellow River, another to the prefect at Wei Hui Fu, and another to the magistrate at Hsü Hsien. We were afraid of delay in being referred from one yamen to the other.

We got no help from the prefect. An escort however was promised by the district magistrate, and friendly messages were returned. But he refused to take charge of our house, saying that in the present state he could not possibly guarantee protection of our property.

Things were at their very darkest on the 27th. We had got together the few things that we had decided to take with us, but it looked as if we should require to make our escape in the dark, taking no more with us than we might be able to carry ourselves. The carters who had agreed to take us had backed out of their bargains and would not come near us, though we offered four or five times the usual rates. Our servants were panic stricken, as we heard of one band of desperate characters planning to attack us before we left our premises; and of another band at the other end of the town formed for the purpose of attacking us after we left.

There was no sleep for us that night; indeed there had not been much for several nights; but this particular one was passed in trying to put courage into our servants, and in spurring on the few friends we had in the town to take active measures on our behalf. We induced one man—our teacher (a literary graduate)—to interview the leaders of one band, and by reasoning, expostulating, and threatening, to persuade them to let us go in peace. Another friend performed the same office with the other band. But the argument that weighed most with both was that we had failed to secure carts and could carry nothing away with us.

Daybreak of the 28th arrived, and while we welcomed it as a relief from the terror of the night, we dreaded it as the day on which we should have to set out on our journey without having been able to make proper arrangements for transport. We had sent a messenger to a neighboring town to secure carts there at any cost, and as he had not yet returned we feared he had failed in his mission. To our great relief, he turned up with four carts while we were pretending to take breakfast. It did not take us long to get our boxes and bedding on board.

And here one of those incidents occurred that force us to believe in a special providence. Just as we were almost ready to mount our carts and face the mob that had gathered around our door, the



officer in command of the militia in our town returned from an expedition against some robbers, bringing prisoners with him. At our request he called on us and we persuaded him to send some of his men to escort us a few miles on our way. This nonplussed the mob, who got the impression that the officer had come by arrangement for our special protection. And the fact that he had prisoners with him proved to the rowdies that he did not hold his office in vain.

The whole town was gathered together to see us off, and lined the streets three and four deep on both sides all the way from our house to the town gates; but all passed off quietly and a few miles out our special escort left us to the care of four men who had been provided by our magistrate. We made our first halt at Wei Hai Fu, and at once sent our cards to both civil and military officials, also to Father Gerrard, who called on us in the course of the evening. We explained the situation to the priest and invited him to join our party. He replied that he had not power to do so without permission from his bishop, and if the bishop concluded that it was not safe for the priests to remain at their posts, they would all retire to a place already prepared among the hills, where all their converts were armed and could hold out against an army.

The military official arrived just in time to disperse the mob that had gathered around the door of the inn, and was getting beyond the control of our escort. The local soldiers dispersed them and we had peace for the rest of the night. Next day we halted at Hsin Hsiang Hsien for our midday meal. I was well known at this place, and put up at the inn of a man who had been friendly for some years. We had been there about an hour when this innkeeper told us that some Boxers had arrived in the town a day or two before and that some of them had just come to him making inquiries about us, our destination, etc. We at once sent our card to the official to inform him and ask for protection. The only result was that we were told that the official was not at home, and that our informant was at once sent for by the Yamen people and told to get rid of us at once. We started off fully expecting to be pursued by the Boxers, but reached our inn at night without having heard anything more of them, and from there on "Boxers" seemed to be an unknown term.

Next day, 30th, we reached Yuan Wu Hsien, quite close to the ferry on the Yellow River, where we were to meet Mr. Jameson and party. The official here at once put a strong guard at the door of our inn and thus secured perfect quietness for us inside.

In the evening we were much relieved by the arrival of a mounted messenger from Mr. Jameson, bringing word that he and his party were coming with a large escort, plenty of silver, and a few firearms.

Next day, Sunday, 1st July, we got to the bank of the Yellow River first and waited two hours for Mr. Jameson. When they arrived, we found them dressed in Chinese costume. They had found the people at Wu Chih Hsien—their last halting place—very rude. The magistrate not only declared he could not protect them unless they put on Chinese clothing, but made them give up much of their luggage. The clothing not only failed as a disguise, but seemed to emphasize the fact that they were refugees, and must have been meant by the officials to humiliate them or else as a practical joke, for they certainly looked awkward and clumsy.

Just as we got to the south bank of the river, we saw the Chang Te Fu and Chi'u Wang party arrive on the north bank, so we waited till they came across. We were now a large company—made up as follows: Chi'u Wang party, Mr. and Mrs. MacKenzie and one child, Dr. and Mrs. Leslie, Misses McIntosh and Dow; Chang Te Fu party, Mr. and Mrs. Goforth and three children, Miss Pyke and Miss Dr. Wallace, Messrs. Griffith and Hood; Hsin Chen party, Mr. and Mrs. Mitchell, Mr. and Mrs. Slimmon and one child; Pekin Syndicate party, Messrs. Jameson, Reid, and Fisher. The missionaries had only a small escort, but Mr. Jameson's party had a fine escort of mounted men, and a petty court officer who was very useful in making arrangements with officials by the way, about local escorts, inns, etc. Having now the Yellow River between us and the Boxers, we got off bright and early next morning, all in good spirits, with the exception of Mrs. Slimmon, who was beginning to be anxious about her baby, who showed signs of breaking down under the strain of the journey.

Mr. Jameson was inspired with a happy thought this morning and sent a man off on horseback to dispatch a telegram from K'ai Feng Fu to the British and American consuls at Hankow, informing them of our whereabouts and asking that help be sent. The messenger had 70 miles to go, 70 miles back, and then to catch up with a party traveling 35 miles a day. It was a great undertaking, but Mr. Jameson was not a man to be daunted by difficulties, and the feat was accomplished at the expense of the plucky little pony, that died after reaching Fan Ch'eng. The sending of the telegram proved to have been a wise proceeding, as it conveyed to our friends the first intimation that we were alive, and also enabled our consuls to get Chang Chih Tung to send us much-needed help.

The next two days we suffered much from heat, as we were traveling through the loess region. The sun blazing down into the deep roads made them like ovens, and the roads being 30 or 40 feet below

the level of the country, there was no possibility of getting any breeze. On reaching Hsiang Hsien we found Mr. and Mrs. Gracie living in seeming peace and quietness. They were surprised to learn that we were fleeing for our lives and invited Mrs. Slimmon and myself to stay with them for a while and give our little one a chance to recover. She was by this time very ill indeed, and we were sorely tempted to run the risks and accept the invitation. But at midnight Mr. Gracie came to our inn and told us that the converts and friends had strongly advised them to join our party, which they decided to do and would have done, but found it impossible to secure carts. They expected to be able to do so in the course of the day and try to overtake us. Subsequently we learned that they made their escape by way of Chou Chia K'ou to the province of Anhui, having most harrowing experiences by the way.

We were now approaching the Nan Yang Fu district, the only place where we really anticipated any trouble, and our fears proved to be only too well grounded. On the 7th July we arrived at Hsin Tien, thirty li north of Nan Yang city. We had intended halting there for the night, but on our arrival we found it impossible to get accommodations for the whole party. Mr. Jameson, with his usual thoughtfulness for the ladies and children, decided to push on to Nan Yang city, well knowing that it was a most dangerous place at which to halt.

And just here I would like to say that Mr. Jameson and his party nobly fulfilled the promise that they personally, and all they had, would be at our disposal. They not only gave us the best rooms at the inns when there was any choice, but shared their stores with us, giving up their last tins of milk when they learned that our friends had exhausted their own supply. They let us have all the silver we needed, and without this help it would have been impossible for us to get along. Mr. Jameson also proved himself to be a born leader. It was a great relief to leave everything in his hands, knowing that there was no detail of arrangements, such as interviewing mandarins, getting the daily local escort, securing inns, and the hundred and one little things incidental to such a journey, but were in most capable hands. He never seemed worried or anxious, but had a cheery word of encouragement for each one as he went his daily rounds.

On leaving Yu Chou at daybreak Mr. Goforth's servant took the wrong road and later the other parties got separated from us and went by a different way. This took the large company of ladies and children safely past a procession of rain dancers that we ran into in one of the towns en route. Mr. Jameson and his friends were on horseback 500 yards ahead of our carts, and suddenly found themselves surrounded by an armed body of men 200 strong, followed by a huge rabble. The rain dancers wore green wreaths on their heads, and were armed with huge swords, being on a pilgrimage to a famous temple to pray for rain. Catching sight of the foreigners they at once surrounded them, crying out "Here are the foreign devils that have chased away the rain." One of the leaders suggested killing them at once, and our friends had a bad ten minutes persuading the crowd that it would be a dangerous thing to try. Meanwhile we came to the fringe of the crowd, and, learning that it was a rain procession, we did not stay to make further inquiries but turned hastily up the first lane, which proved to be a cul de sac, and our carts stood there with their backs toward the main street, effectually screening us from the mob, who passed by quite unaware of the fact that there were foreign women in their midst. Upon getting through the town we found Mr. Jameson and friends filled with the gravest apprehensions for our safety.

We arrived at Nan Yang Fu after dark, and, searching the city for quarters, had finally to separate and put up in miserably poor inns, but this turned out to our advantage. We approached our inns from the south, thus throwing those off the scent who were expecting us from the north. On trying to see the official we were told he would see us at 8 o'clock next morning. This looked ominous. At midnight a messenger arrived from the party at Hsin Tien, saying they were besieged in their inn, and asking for help. We tried to see the mandarin to get help for our friends, but only succeeded in getting a promise that some runners would be dispatched to put down the disturbance. Mr. Jameson, seeing that it was useless to expect help from the mandarins, sent back half of his mounted escort.

Some of our servants told us that the Roman Catholics had been besieged in their fortified place 4 miles away, and that a soldier had been beheaded by the officials, because he had carried out their orders too literally and in trying to disperse the besiegers had injured one of them. We also learned that plans had been made to kill the whole of our party, and it was for this reason that we had been told to wait till 8 o'clock next morning.

Realizing our danger, we at once got our tired animals hitched up again and got off at 3 o'clock and traveled to Hsin Yeh Hsien. Here some of the mounted men who had been sent back to Hsin Tien to help our friends turned up and told us what had been taking place. Our friends had been in negotiation with their besiegers, who were demanding a large sum of money. They waited on in